LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXVIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1934 NUMBER 1010

Contents

The Week 225

Editorials

The President's First Defeat 228
What Happened in the Ukraine 229

General Articles

Not Kerensky: Lloyd George .....Bruce Bliven 231
Pie in the Sky .....Keith Howard 232
Roosevelt and the Power Problem .....Morris Llewellyn Cooke 235
Three Types of Poetry: III .....Allen Tate 237
Washington Notes .....T. R. B. 240
Other People's Money .....John T. Flynn 241
On the Labor Front .....William P. Mangold 242
Prejudice Purely .....Lincoln Kirstein 243
Early European Music .....Paul Rosenfeld 244

Correspondence 245

Might It Be Mountains? .....Stark Young 246

Books in Review

The Victorian Tragedy .....Robert Morss Lovett 247
Looking at America .....B. B. 248
Summer Is Over .....Janet Lewis 248
Seven Economists Dancing on the Point of a Needle .....Edwin C. Witte 249
The Frost-Bitten Age ..... Emmy Blitzstein 249
Two Spies .....Griffin Barry 250
Books in Brief 250

The Week

IN THE reorganization of the N.R.A., one of the principal changes is the installation in every industry of a labor-adjustment board, composed of one representative of employees, one of employers, and one impartial member. Such boards already existed under a few codes, such as textiles and clothing. In any industry where there is a strong, independent union, a board such as this, with subordinate regional bodies, is a logical and efficient way of handling disputes. It is much better than a general labor board covering all industries of a given geographical region, which is likely to be inexpert in the problems of all its many industries and is certain to be overworked. But no adjustment machinery can work effectively unless labor is properly organized to make it work. If the new adjustment boards proceed on the principle of the automobile settlement, placing company unions on an equality with genuine ones; if they are used to upset the authority and policy of the National Labor Board, so far as that policy has been to give collective bargaining a chance, their creation will be a calamity. This will be particularly true if they are employed in any way to enforce compulsory arbitration and deny the right to strike—something to which no real union would consent.

WARREN T. THAYER, of Chateaugay, New York, is a member of the State Senate and of its Committee on Public Service, of which he was formerly chairman. This Committee has for years been notoriously tender toward utility interests, and many a bill designed to curb those interests has died under its fond ministrations. For this reason, there was unusual public interest in some correspondence of Senator Thayer's, recently made public by the Federal Trade Commission. In 1927 he wrote to S. J. Magee, vice-president of the Associated Gas and Electric Company, saying: "I hope my work during the past session was satisfactory to your company, not so much for the new legislation enacted, but from the fact that many detrimental bills were introduced which we were able to kill in my committee." A few months later, he wrote Mr. Magee that he had spent $457 during a village election and added, "Will you kindly advise me if it would be satisfactory to put this amount in my next expense account to Mr. Pierce, the same as I did last year?" Publication of these letters has greatly astonished some people, who evidently did not dream that a state legislator ever had any sort of connection with a public-utility company. Numerous demands have been made for an investigation, and Mr. Thayer himself has finally piped up feebly to the same effect. Among those doubtless most interested in the investigation will be W. Kingsland Macy, who as state chairman of the Republican party, charged some time ago that the New York State Assembly is under the dominance of public-utility interests.

MEANWHILE the Federal Trade Commission has disclosed some additional interesting material regarding the Associated Gas and Electric Company. This company was interested in the purchase

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a municipal power plant in Paris, Tennessee, through the Kentucky-Tennessee Power and Light Company, one of its subsidiaries. Some of the people in Paris did not want to sell their municipal power plant, and the Federal Trade Commission says that peculiar methods were used in negotiating the sale. Mr. George L. Fryer was the city attorney of Paris, a strategic position, and received—from somebody—$2,000 for services that seem obscure. Mr. James Porter, a member of the City Council, was hostile to the sale. He owned an ice plant in Paris, and somebody started a rival plant. Who that somebody was is indicated in a letter from H. D. Fitch, president of the Kentucky-Tennessee Power and Light Company, to Mr. Magee. Says Mr. Fitch: "We have set up a very severe ice competition with his property, and he is beginning to squeal." Subsequently, the Federal Trade Commission notes, Mayor Arnett of Paris was given a job in the electric-light plant, for no very clear reason, and held it for nine months. The Associated Gas and Electric Company says that if there was any wrongdoing, it was the work of private individuals not connected with the company, and that the United States Circuit Court of Appeals unanimously decided in its favor when the issue of the purchase was thrown into the courts. Moreover, the United States Supreme Court refused to review the case. If the company is as innocent as it says, however, it can hardly object to a thorough review of the facts before an impartial public body.

SENATOR Thayer and the Associated Gas and Electric Company may be as pure as Sapolio, or purer; but if they are, they will be an exception and not the rule. Readers of The New Republic do not need to be told that throughout the United States and for many years past, public-utility companies have spared no effort to control legislatures, regulatory bodies, the press and all other media for influencing public opinion. So completely have they succeeded that many persons who have followed their activities closely believe regulation is an utter failure and that only public ownership and operation can prevent merciless exploitation. In the meantime, the Thayer revelations constitute a grand piece of luck for Governor Lehman of New York. He has a program to cut the claws of utilities in New York State, embodied in nine bills that have long been slumbering in the benevolent custody of the committee of which Senator Thayer is a member. Everyone agrees that regardless of the outcome of the pending investigation, there is now a far better chance that these worthy measures will be passed.

WHEN the Unemployed Writers' Association first made its demand that the government should recognize the plight of its members as professional authors, and not just lump them in with the "white collar jobless," much of the comment in the daily press was humorous—in intent if not in result. To ever so many people it seemed funny that writing should be considered a profession and that its practitioners should object to being put at other jobs even while on relief. Now, however, the demands of the U.W.A., and of other groups with the same general attitude, seem on the road to realization. Before the demobilization of the C.W.A., the government was considering a plan to put writers to work recording the folklore of the regions they know best. Some of this might have been published, and all of it would have been available in the Library of Congress and elsewhere, as source material for other writers. There is still a chance that this plan will go through; if it does not, much of the same work can be done through the states and cities.

THE Authors' League of America, which is pushing the project, has already obtained favorable consideration from the New York City authorities for several suggestions. One of these is a series of "human interest" reports on life among the unemployed or those on C.W.A. and other projects. Some of these would be dramatized by unemployed writers and given as radio plays over the municipal broadcasting station. Another project that ought to be popular, is a booklet on the free amusements available in New York City, to be published and sold at a nominal price, the profits, if any, to revert to the governmental agency putting up the money. Meanwhile, the U.W.A. is continuing its effort to get full recognition and relief for all writers, as such; and it ought to. There is just as much social waste in making an unemployed writer act as a bookkeeper as there is in putting an unemployed surgeon to sharpening pencils.

NEITHER a federal injunction nor the scathing publicity of the report of a federal commission has any effect on the mobsters of the Imperial Valley of California. Last January, during the strike of the lettuce pickers, A. L. Wirin, attorney of the American Civil Liberties Union, was kidnaped, strike meetings were broken up, union organizers jailed on flimsy excuses and "outside" speakers forcibly driven out of town. A federal injunction was obtained, restraining the police of the valley from interfering with the lawful acts of the vegetable workers, and after the lettuce season was over a distinguished federal commission issued a report on the reign of lawlessness in the Valley, denounced it, pointed out ways to avoid it—and, closing on the mention of organization work going on among the jailed strikers, hoped for the best in the next picking season.

THE next picking season, that for melons, is now at hand, and melons do not prove radically different from lettuce. The result of the strikers' organizing during their jail terms shows in a growing strike movement. Again "outsiders" are called in to speak at strikers' meetings, and again the armed mob of the Valley contemptuously shows its hand.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Three speakers, Dr. Alexander Irvine, Ellis O. Jones and Miss Lenore Hardin, were kidnaped in broad daylight on the streets of Calexico and dropped in the desert, the two men being beaten. Ernest Besig, A.C.L.U. attorney, was kindly locked in jail to protect him. So now will the distinguished federal commission reconvene and issue another worthy report pending the tomato season? Or will the Governor of California take official cognizance of the independent enclave of anarchy that has sprung up within his state?

THE National Labor Board has, within the past few weeks, scheduled some dozen industrial disputes for prosecution, among them that of the National Lock Company of Rockford, Illinois. This case is unusual not only because 400 employees of the company have been on strike for nearly nine months but chiefly for the reason that the company—in addition to getting the usual injunctions against picketing—also obtained one against the members of the Chicago Regional Labor Board, restraining them from *conducting any hearing or making any report.* The Board denounced this action, declaring it an insult to the federal authorities, but attempts by the United States Attorney to have the injunction overruled have proved unavailing. At the hearings held a short time ago, the National Labor Board found that the company exhibited a "studied hostility to the purposes of Section 7a" and that certain questions of fact were still in dispute—possibly because the restrictive features of the injunction had prevented an adequate investigation!

THIS week we learn, however, that the National Lock Company has suddenly changed its mind and is now anxious to enter into negotiations. The threat of prosecution, it seems, has had a sobering effect. Another concern that has experienced a similar change of heart is the well known Harriman Hosiery Company of Harriman, Tennessee. This company, it will be remembered, has insisted since last September that it could never deal with the A.F. of L. Well, its case was recently sent to the Department of Justice, and we are happy to report that the company is now negotiating directly with the American Federation of Hosiery Workers. From these and several other cases of the same sort, it would appear that Section 7a and the National Labor Board might be in better repute today if prosecution—or, rather, the threat of prosecution—had been resorted to six months ago.

WHEN the United States was considering recognition for Russia, timorous souls warned us that if this were done, the Bolshevists would be enabled to make propaganda in this country. Russia has been recognized, Comrade Troyanovsky is here as ambassador, and the Tories' worst fears are now realized. He has come out in a public statement in favor of—democracy. Moreover, he gives it as his opinion that a country where private profit is abolished is the only one where democracy can flourish. We heartily agree that to endorse democracy nowadays is indeed radical and subversive doctrine. At the same time, it is such a refreshing novelty in a country where all our great men are spending their time wailing about Communism and Fascism, that we would even be willing to hear a little more about it.

IN THE course of the first year of Hitler a not inconsiderable number of leading Social Democrats and Communists went over to the National Socialists. To say that all acted from opportunistic motives and none from conviction is too harsh a judgment. Yet with the threat of prison, concentration camp, torture, with concern for their families, with such powerful fears in the background of their thoughts it could not have been hard to convince themselves that what National Socialism really stood for was what they had really believed in. Not one of these converts was as shameless in his self-vindication, as indifferent to the honor of his party and his past, as Karl Severing, whose book "My Road to Hitler" is now announced for publication. Severing was always looked upon as the "strong man" of the Social Democracy—a reputation gained chiefly by the brutality with which he proceeded against Communists and other revolutionists in the post-revolutionary period. It was an open secret that Severing, like many others in the Social Democracy, was a nationalist to the core, that he belonged to the large army of German Socialists who saw in the Republic the end and aim of their aspirations. Yet nothing in Severing's past can make his avowal of National Socialism anything less than infamous.

FEW things in Nazi Germany more clearly reveal the depths of its cultural degradation than the two facts that the Vossische Zeitung, the Breslauer Zeitung, the Hamburger Correspondent and almost one hundred other organs of high standing have had to cease publication, and that Adolf Hitler's Völkische Beobachter has become the official organ of public opinion in the Reich. If rumors of the speedy demise of the Frankfurter Zeitung prove well founded, Germany will have lost the foremost of that proud chain of daily publications which to the world have always been the concrete expression of the nation's cultural ideals and understanding. In its last issue, that of March 31, the Vossische Zeitung ventured to express faint though conciliatory criticism of existing conditions in German newspaperdom: "The pendulum has swung from unbridled freedom of expression to occasional over-discipline." It deplored its inability to inform the reader of certain occurrences which placed upon them "the burden of reading foreign newspapers" and closed its valedictory with the thoroughly dishonest statement that the government is not altogether responsible for these unwholesome conditions and desires constructive criticism, laying the blame

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on subordinate officials. The news that Paul Scheffer, for many years the Moscow and Washington correspondent of the Berliner Tageblatt, has become the editor of that now abjectly coördinated organ, must have come as a distinctly disagreeable surprise to his friends on this side of the Atlantic who had always admired him—despite his biased anti-Bolshevist position—as a man of unimpeachable intellectual integrity.

IN THE article by Mary Heaton Vorse in our issue of April 4, the membership of the Mechanics' Educational Society of America, a union of automobile workers, was given as 1,800. This was a typographical error; the correct figure is 18,000.

The President's First Defeat

THE OVERRIDING of the President's veto on the bill to restore in part the salary cuts of federal employees and increase veterans' compensation is significant; but just what it signifies is open to question. We cannot conscientiously join our many daily contemporaries in an outburst of righteous indignation by asserting that Congress has defied a President who has a great and unified recovery program, and has done so at the behest of selfish, predatory interests. After all, the country has not gone in for a real dictatorship, and so long as it has not, it is difficult to adhere to the principle that Congress should be in all things subservient to the Executive's will, no matter what the issue at stake. Nor is it true that the President's program is so well knit, so unitary in its philosophy and so generally wise that it cannot be altered in any given particular without disaster. The real question is whether the bill itself is defensible.

As far as the law's effect on federal employees is concerned, we believe firmly that Congress is right and the President wrong. No inconsistency in the whole New Deal is more glaring than that involved in reducing the pay and numbers of useful government workers while striving in all other ways to increase employment and raise wages. The government itself has been, from the first of the recovery effort, the major chiseler. By what possible logic the administration could use all the powers at its command to make private industry raise wage rates and take on more workers while it was pursuing precisely the opposite policy with its own hundreds of thousands of employees has been beyond our comprehension. Either it was trying to expand purchasing power or it was not. Either it was trying to inflate or it was trying to deflate. With every salary check reduced and every competent worker turned off, it has been helping to counteract whatever good effect might have been expected from the labor policy it was asking private industry to pursue.

The crippling of the Post Office Department under Postmaster General Farley, with the actual misery this policy has caused to thousands of substitute clerks and carriers, has been nothing less than outrageous. It is true that in resisting this pressure, the postal employees, along with other federal workers, have been seeking their own interest. But in doing so they are, according to the administration's own economic philosophy, seeking the general interest. We are glad that they have been partially successful, and that the pressure they have brought to bear upon Congress has had some result. We do not see how any intelligent and honest congressman could have denied the logic of their appeal. We hope that further measures will be enacted to force Mr. Farley to about-face.

The inconsistency of the administration in this matter has extended beyond the difference between its treatment of regular employees and its policy for private industry. The lack of harmony has been even sharper between the "economy" practised in the government's permanent staff and the relative liberality of its appropriations for emergency purposes. Why hire a lot of men to build battleships while cutting off useful scientific work and driving letter carriers to exhaustion? Why employ the jobless to rake leaves and plant shrubs and make trails through the woods while throwing postal substitutes on the mercy of charity? The technical reason for making this distinction is, of course, that the ordinary employees come under the ordinary budget, which must be balanced by current receipts in order that the credit of the government may be good enough to borrow the large sums of money necessary for the extraordinary expenditures. The theory is that as long as the ordinary budget, including interest and amortization on the borrowings, is balanced, there is no danger of uncontrollable budgetary inflation. It is a good theory. But it has become a little tenuous in practice. It is particularly tenuous when the ordinary budget is balanced by reductions in public pay and employment instead of by a sufficient increase in taxes. The chief reason for making the extraordinary expenditures is to increase spending generally and prime the industrial pump. But the same logic applies to ordinary expenditures. A dollar spent by a department clerk is just as good as a dollar spent by a soldier of the C.C.C.

There is not the slightest danger of uncontrollable inflation from paying the full salaries and retaining the jobs of regular government employees. Even if we had to borrow money for a couple of years to do so, it would not be ruinous. The sum thus at stake is a trifling percentage of the total national expenditures. The real danger is in borrowing money to pay interest on past debt, since interest is a much larger item of the budget and one capable of indefinite growth if there were no check on it, such as is provided by a policy of meeting interest payments out of tax receipts. It is now obvious that the increase in expenses resulting from restoration of salaries is trivial and is almost certain to be covered by a growth in tax receipts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The part of the bill referring to veterans is, on the contrary, vicious in principle and will be far more costly in the long run. Neither men nor their families should derive pay from the government because of participation in a war, except in so far as this compensation is due for actual losses incurred in that participation or for service-connected disabilities. There is, however, a much deeper significance than this in the irresistible pressure for an enlargement of pensions. The persons in question were desperately insistent because, on account of the economic breakdown, many of them had no means of earning their living. It is one thing to refuse unjust compensation to veterans who have a chance to support themselves otherwise; quite another to refuse it to economic casualties. The failure to solve the problem of unemployment made it nearly certain that the veterans' lobby would get what it wanted.

For this failure, both Mr. Roosevelt and the financial interests which protest so loudly against the passage of the bill are responsible. The recovery program itself has gone awry because business, with the permission of the administration, has insisted on keeping control in its own hands, and has used this control to raise prices of processed and manufactured articles faster than the incomes of farmers and wage earners have risen. This necessarily restricts sales and output and slows down the program of reëmployment. Shortening of working hours alone is an inadequate means of enlarging employment, so long as production does not immensely increase. Production cannot increase sufficiently to absorb the unemployed workers unless the purchasing power of the masses grows far more than it has done. And this cannot occur so long as business continues to apply the principles of the economy of scarcity by raising prices faster than costs and by restricting output.

The passage of the bonus is traceable to the policies of the N.R.A., to the failure to spend money quickly enough on public works, to the lack of an adequate housing program, to the sabotage by business interests, which in every direction hampers any effort to change the distribution of purchasing power and produce abundance for everyone. The nemesis is that millions remain without a means of support, and bring to bear on the government pressure to aid them through any possible channel, whether by pensions or relief. No government in which a vestige of democracy remains can resist this pressure for long; it must keep the people alive. The burden will either return to business in the form of taxes, or lead to budgetary inflation through continued borrowing. There is no escaping it. If only the rulers of our economic society would draw the correct conclusion from the President's defeat on this issue, they would see that they themselves are to blame. The real significance of this event is ominous indeed, but it is ominous not because Congress is unruly, but because it gives evidence of the incurable sickness of capitalism.

What Happened in the Ukraine

EARLY last summer newspapers all over the world, and especially in Germany, were full of stories about the Russian famine, which supposedly centered in the Ukraine. The foreign correspondents in Moscow were barraged with orders to make their way into the Ukraine at any cost and cable home authentic stories of the conditions there. Just at this moment the Soviet government closed the Ukraine to correspondents, with the result that the wildest kind of rumors began to spread. Some people soberly claimed that 30,000,000 people had starved to death—in spite of the fact that the whole population of the Ukrainian Republic is less than 30,000,000.

After several months the truth is beginning to be established. There was indeed a shortage of food which reached almost to famine proportions. How many people starved to death is not known; while Walter Duranty of The New York Times conjectured an increase in the death rate of 300 percent, Soviet officials state that in no district was the increase large enough to affect the vital statistics. Workers with regular jobs and peasants who belonged to the collective farms were on reduced, but not starvation, rations. On the other hand, there were bands of unattached people roaming the country without any regular source of food. The famine or shortage—call it by any name you choose—was not in itself severe enough to explain the barring of correspondents.

Last summer a counter-revolutionary separatist movement developed in the Ukraine. The movement was not only aggravated by the food shortage; it was also partly the cause of that shortage, since the separatists had been fighting hard to make the collective-farm program a failure. But the Ukrainian separatist movement had other causes which go far back into history. There had always been considerable animosity between the Little Russian peasants and the governors set over them by the Great Russia of St. Petersburg and Moscow. During the civil war that followed the Russian Revolution, the fighting was bloodiest in the Ukraine, which was also the last district to be evacuated by the Whites. This ancient enmity was revived when the collective-farm program was introduced in 1929 and 1930. The peasants of Great Russia, who had retained the tradition of the *mir*, or village commune, accepted the new order of things more readily than those of the Ukraine, where there was a higher percentage of rich peasants employing hired hands. The Soviet government did not allow for this local situation. Meanwhile the richer peasants were willing to adopt the slogan of "self-determination for the Ukraine" because they regarded self-determination as the only means of preserving their own privileged status. And they were encouraged by leaders of the counter-revolutionary movement.

The first hint that this movement had reached dangerous proportions was the announcement on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

July 8 that N. A. Skripnik, at various times Commissar of Labor, Justice and Education, and member of the political bureau of the Ukrainian Communist party, had committed suicide following the discovery that his high standing as a Soviet leader was being used for their own ends by certain counter-revolutionary groups. In November, at the plenary sessions of the Ukrainian Communist party, surprising revelations were made. It had been learned that many counter-revolutionists had penetrated into the Ukraine, either by posing as members of the Galician Communist party seeking refuge from Polish persecutions, or else as repentant émigrés who had returned to serve their own land. A number of secret organizations were unearthed and suppressed—"Union for the Liberation of the Ukraine," "Ukrainian National Center," "Ukrainian Military Organization." Many members of these societies had been posing as Communist party members, and some of them had achieved high positions.

One of those arrested was Ataman Bukshovani, who at one time had commanded a White Guard rifle division. Last year he had gained admission to the Ukraine as a Communist refugee from Galicia. He testified at the trial:

> In the latter half of February, I was informed that Sushko had arrived in Berlin and wished to see me. This occurred after Hitler got into power. Sushko told me that he and Alfred Rosenberg had discussed the situation. . . . Germany was taking a sharply anti-Soviet course and was entering into coöperation with Italy, England and France in order to create an interventionist bloc for action against the U.S.S.R.; Germany was also approaching Poland in an attempt to draw her into this bloc. Rosenberg advised the Ukrainian Military Organization to commence direct action against the Soviet government, pointing out that the advent of Hitler to power furnished favorable conditions for the separation of the Ukraine from the U.S.S.R. and for creating, with the aid of the interventionists, a Ukrainian nationalist government.

However credible or incredible Bukshovani is as a witness, all these events are now in the past. The secret counter-revolutionary organizations were broken up in October. During the course of last year's "party cleaning" in the Ukraine, 27,500 members were expelled from the Communist party up to October 15; probably those included almost all of the counter-revolutionists who had achieved high positions. But the measures taken with regard to the collective-farm situation were more important because they struck at the roots of the disease instead of merely at its symptoms. Seed was advanced last spring to the collective farms. They were further enriched with new agricultural equipment; and at the time of the last harvest those in the Ukraine had at their disposal 43,600 tractors and 4,254 combines. Communists chosen for their vigor and discretion were assigned to the tractor stations, and 7,000 rank and file members of the party received permanent assignments as chairmen of collective farms, secretaries of party cells and party organizers. A new, vigorous element was introduced into rural life—and last summer the bountiful harvest changed the whole face of the country.

Thomas Carmen, at that time on the staff of The Moscow Daily News, passed through the Ukraine in May and again in September. In May, he says:

> The railway stations along the route I traveled bore eloquent testimony to the crop failure of the preceding year. Everywhere there were unmistakable signs of privation. That part of the peasantry which stubbornly resisted collectivization now felt the full brunt of the shortage they had largely caused. In motley droves they roved the countryside in search of food. But what food there was, the government conserved for the workers who loyally stuck to their jobs in the factories and for the peasants who remained by their tractors and plows.
>
> But what a different experience was traveling over the same route in September! Over the entire stretch of the Ukraine from Kharkov to Odessa there was scarcely a beggar to be seen. The men and women who a few months before appeared more willing to starve than to aid in the program, had sensed the futility of further opposition, and gone back to work on the farms and in industry. The spirit of the entire people had undergone a striking change. Odessa, where the crop failure of the previous summer was most devastatingly felt, was like a city reborn.

On several occasions The New Republic has referred to the plan sponsored by Rosenberg in Germany, by Lord Rothermere in England and by other international adventurers, to separate the Ukraine from Soviet Russia, to give the western half of it to Poland, and to set up in the eastern half a Ukrainian nationalist state with French and British spheres of influence. For a while last summer, when Russia was faced simultaneously by the threat of war in the East and by a food shortage at home, it must have seemed to the intriguers that this crazy plan had some chance of success. But the moment is past when it could depend on peasant dissatisfaction. The Ukraine, where the disaffected element was always in a minority even during periods of extreme privation, is now one of the most prosperous sections of the Soviet Union.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1934, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT. DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Kerensky: Lloyd George

DR. WILLIAM WIRT, Superintendent of Schools in a town owned by the United States Steel Corporation, has lately stirred up a good deal of excitement in Congress by saying that he had been told President Roosevelt was to be only a Kerensky of the new American Revolution, with a Stalin or a Hitler (Dr. Wirt can't make up his mind which) coming later. This incident chiefly proves that Dr. Wirt and Congress don't read the papers. Six months ago the commonest cliché of journalism was the suggestion about the President's Kerenskyhood.

I should like to suggest a better historical analogy for what Mr. Roosevelt is and may become. It is the career of David Lloyd George.

Lloyd George first came to power in England as a mild progressive; but not long after he had emerged upon the national stage, he began to talk in terms that were very radical indeed for pre-war England *circa* 1909. When he introduced the 1909-10 budget he described it as a "war-budget" in the conflict with poverty. He demanded, then and during the next few years, unemployment insurance, health insurance and a drastic land and taxation policy that showed familiarity with the works of Henry George. In particular, he planned taxes on great wealth that came up to the very edge of confiscation. The first two items on this list he obtained, and then came the Great War. In the field of domestic reform he went into a state of suspended animation from 1914 until after the Versailles peace; and then, at least in his own mind, he returned to his program where he had left off. He continued to work on it until 1922, when his government was defeated and he returned to private life.

Looking at his public career as a whole, what do we find? With the exceptions already noted, we find him talking in the most radical terms, denouncing the money-changers in the temple, but never doing anything about them. Year after year, he went on putting himself at the head of the forces fighting for intensive reform, and leading them into the wilderness. At the end of the War he promised to make England "a land fit for heroes to live in," but in fact he left it a land where many thousands of these heroes couldn't even get a job and were forced to beg in the streets. In 1920, he developed a grandiose "New Deal" of his own. Free public education was to be enormously extended. The poor of England were to be rehoused, as he had promised a decade earlier in his famous "Whitechapel campaign." There was to be a universal maximum working week of forty-eight hours (short by the standards of those days in Great Britain). There was to be a national minimum wage. The struggle between capital and labor was to be solved by "industrial councils" on which worker and employer were to have equal representation. The great estates were to be broken up and their idle land put to use. A committee of experts was to draw the blue print for a planned economy in regard to coal.

Unfortunately, few of these things were ever done. Among the wealthy people in England, frightened by the size of their taxes, there developed an Anti-Waste party, and in the face of their determined opposition Lloyd George, without a fundamental social policy or deep and burning convictions, gave way. When the railroad men, caught between rising prices and static wages, threatened a stoppage, no Tory squire could have denounced them more fiercely than Lloyd George, who broke the strike in ten days. When Irish railroad workers objected to carrying munitions that were to be used to shoot down Irish revolutionists, he angrily threatened to suspend all service on the roads. When the Sankey Report recommended nationalization of the coal mines, "radical" Lloyd George refused to accept it. When the landowners howled, the agricultural policy was dropped. From motives of economy, the program of the Ministry of Health was so mutilated that its director, Dr. Addison, resigned in disgust. Most of the education plan was abandoned for the same reason. As for the elaborate plan for industrial councils, his biographer remarks sadly that "This well intentioned effort was of no avail," and labor and capital were in the main left to fight it out as before.

Yet through it all, Lloyd George continued to be a master orator on behalf of the rights of the common man. In speech after speech he promised to destroy the power of entrenched wealth. Huge crowds went to hear him wherever he appeared, and shook the roofbeams with applause as he rededicated himself to the struggle against poverty and for peace and security for every man, woman and child. The one weakness in his otherwise perfect record was, as I have suggested, that he did hardly any of the things necessary to bring about the Utopia he promised.

If I were President Roosevelt, I should feel that this career deserved thoughtful attention. Like the little Welshman (who was born, as it happens, in Manchester), the President has a warm and magnetic personality. He, too, has the gift of drawing all sorts of men to him by bonds of personal loyalty. His support among the plain people is at least equal to that of "L. G." during his greatest days. He, also, is master of a public oratory that promises to the poor and humble a fuller life. In the case of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lloyd George, all this came to little or nothing. His two real successes, unemployment and health insurance, were at that time being introduced in most Western European countries, and encountered no more real opposition in England than they would meet in America in, say, about 1940 (if you agree with me that the United States recapitulates the history of Europe with a lag of about thirty years).

When we look at Mr. Roosevelt's first thirteen months in office, what do we see? He denounced the money-changers, but they are still in control of America's financial organization. He promised the good life to the masses of our people, but there are still more than ten million unemployed and wages have risen little—for many, not at all. The President has stood aloof from the effort to write into law quality standards in food and other vital necessities, and that effort has been all but destroyed by the power of organized private interest. Money has been poured out to the farmers, but those among them who needed it most have received the least, and the disparity between agriculture and industry continues. The President talks peace, peace, but he has approved bills authorizing a fantastic increase in naval and air defense . . . Kerensky, after all, promised little and accomplished nothing. The greater tragedy is that of a Lloyd George who promises everything, has the power to do much and leaves behind him a page so nearly blank in history's book.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

Pie in the Sky

The Air-Mail Controversy Down to Date

THE GOVERNMENT is now making plans to return the air mail to the private aviation companies at the earliest possible moment. Mr. Farley has announced that bids are to be received at once, and the army is to relinquish the job within sixty days. The new bids are on a temporary basis until Congress writes its permanent legislation, but there is little doubt that the final contracts will follow the lines now laid down. Companies that had their contracts canceled on the grounds of collusion must be reorganized before they can bid again; but it seems likely that this reorganization will be little more than a technicality. At most, the companies will be required to cut themselves off from airplane manufacturers and from holding companies. The individual officers who were involved in fraud must be dismissed.

The real reason for giving the air mail back to the private companies in such a hurry is a simple one: twelve dead aviators. The country was shocked by these deaths, though it would have accepted with equanimity a far larger number of fatalities in the utterly wasteful and useless activity of war. Mr. Roosevelt, informed by his sensitive political fingertips that the country was holding an adverse judgment, is taking steps to retrieve a political blunder.

Before the incident goes into the closed book of history, however, it may be well to record the fact that the air-mail contracts really were made in fraud and collusion, or in something indistinguishable from them. The evidence revealed by the Senate investigation supports no other conclusion. The law called for competitive bidding, and this was not done. Instead, a group of representatives of certain favored companies met in a room in Washington and parceled out among themselves the air-mail business of the United States. That the contracts thus written were excessively disadvantageous to the government is shown by an infallible barometer: the vast profits of some companies and the huge remuneration of many individuals.

It is further shown: (1) by the fact that these companies felt it necessary to be represented in Washington by individuals to whom they paid large fees—individuals whose sole apparent qualification was the fact that they were related to, or in some way connected with, important political figures; (2) by the destruction of files in the Post Office Department in which some of the companies' transactions were recorded; (3) by the attempt—absolutely unjustified—to persuade the country that they had not had their day in court, whereas in fact for nearly a year the air companies had every opportunity to make a full presentation of their case to the Senate committee. Above all, it is shown by the desperate attempt to throw Colonel Lindbergh's popularity into the scale against the popularity of the President, and to conceal the real issues behind the romantic figure of the young aviator who has had the deep misfortune to be surrounded during his formative years by a group of narrow-minded, sordid buccaneers of big business.

Unfortunately for a sound and honest understanding of the situation relating to the cancellation of air-mail contracts, the interest of the general public was not awakened until the scandal became spectacular. Mainly because most newspapers had not, before that stage was reached, paid much attention to the hearings held by the special Senate committee investigating ocean and air-mail contracts, the disclosures made through the committee, which were the basis of the government's cancellation order, were not widely known. As a consequence,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a considerable body of opinion was formed upon very scanty information respecting the real facts and under the influence of the intense propaganda —actuated by political considerations or commercial self-interest—which was let loose on the occasion of lives lost among Army fliers.

But many things of prime importance had happened before Transcontinental Air Transport sought to realize on its investment of $250,000 in Colonel Charles Augustus Lindbergh by pushing him forward as a screen of defense, and those who were eager to criticize the national administration endeavored to gain advantage by huddling under the wings of the national hero. Those things were revelations made in testimony given before the Senate committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Hugo L. Black of Alabama, which has been sitting for six months.

The committee was authorized by the Senate on February 25, 1933, in a resolution which fully described its scope and purpose, so that, for more than a year, anyone who was interested knew exactly what to expect. The first questionnaire about stock ownership, lists of directors, salaries and so on was sent out to the holder of every air-mail contract on April 29, 1933. The first reply to questionnaires was received about the first of June, 1933, from the United Aircraft and Transport Corporation, and from that time on other replies continued to come in. The answer of United Aircraft and Transport Corporation, in addition to giving what was asked for, contained a long statement of its case, including, incidentally, assertions which the testimony of its officers later showed to be either incorrect or tendencious. On the authority of Mr. A. G. Patterson, investigator for the committee, it is stated that "no one ever asked to testify who has not been allowed to do so." Supplementary questionnaires have been sent out since the first ones were forwarded last April and replies to them have been received; therefore fully eight months elapsed during which the companies were constantly reminded of the committee's existence before public hearings began on January 9.

The testimony on which the Post Office Department mainly relied in making its cancellation order was given by officials of the affected companies or was documentary evidence obtained from their papers and records. The officials whose testimony or whose papers constituted the principal part of the government's case were: F. G. Coburn, formerly president of the Aviation Corporation of Delaware, the holding company for American Airways; Hamer Hinshaw, now with United Airlines, the operating company of United Aircraft and Transport Corporation, and formerly with Aviation Corporation of Delaware; Daniel M. Shaeffer, chairman of the board of Transcontinental Air Transport and vice-president of the Pennsylvania Railroad; Colonel Paul Henderson, vice-president of United Air Lines and also of United Aircraft and Transport, formerly a vice-president of Transcontinental Air Transport and at one time general manager for National Air Transport; William P. MacCracken Jr., attorney for the Western Air Express, Transcontinental and Western Air and other companies. Mr. MacCracken presided at the so-called "spoils conference" of operators at the Post Office Department in May, 1930, at which, it is charged, the mail routes were parceled out. His memorandum of the proceedings of the meeting is one of the important pieces of evidence in the government's case.

Whether air-transport companies will be ruined by the cancellation of their mail contracts—assuming that they are not allowed to put on false whiskers and start all over—may depend on their future management. The record made before the Black committee shows that huge private fortunes were made in some of the combinations by the watering of stock and that some companies dissipated large sums in trying to buy off competition. That some of them received enough money from the government for carrying the mail to put any efficiently and honestly managed enterprise on its feet by that means alone seems obvious. For example, from 1926 to 1933, inclusive, the United Aircraft and Transport Corporation, which includes a number of subsidiaries and has the mail route from New York via Chicago-Omaha-Cheyenne-Salt Lake City to San Francisco, received $40,174,412, or 45.88 percent of the total expenditure for transporting air mail. Aviation Corporation, controlling a number of subsidiaries, during the same period received $18,342,273, or 20.95 percent, and General Motors Corporation, which controls North American Aviation—which in turn owns Transcontinental and Western Air, Eastern Air Transport, Western Air Express and other subsidiaries—received $22,680,612, or 25.91 percent of the whole. The remainder of the $87,564,998 spent for carrying domestic air mail went to smaller companies, which divided less than 8 percent of the total.

The sympathy the air companies are now asking from the public is not altogether convincing in the light of revelations before the committee. When D. M. Shaeffer, chairman of Transcontinental Air Transport—the company that sued in the Federal Court in New York City to enjoin the government from canceling its contract and had the suit thrown out—when Mr. Shaeffer was before the Senate committee, he said that the mail contract meant nothing to his company: "We would have been better off if we had not got it, because we have lost money on it since we have had it. . . . I would say we have lost a million dollars."

But when Senator Black asked if they "wanted to surrender it," the witness hastened to say, "No, sir; we don't want to surrender it."

How some of the easy money from the government found its way about and how enormous sums were made from stock-watering was shown in the examination of Edward A. Deeds and others. Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Deeds is now treasurer of United Aircraft and Transport Corporation, which in six years got $40,000,000 from the government. He is now only thirty-one years old and was only twenty-three when he went with Pratt and Whitney, one of United's subsidiaries. Since 1926 this young man has received $151,176 in bonuses and $142,615 in salaries. In addition, he was let in on the watered-stock deal of Pratt and Whitney and on an investment of $40 made a cash profit of $1,060,314. He still has 15,000 shares of stock.

Frederick B. Rentschler, a brother of Gordon S. Rentschler, president of the National City Bank of New York, is vice-president of the board of United Aircraft and Transport Corporation. By the Pratt and Whitney stock expansion his investment of $253 brought a cash profit of $9,514,867 and left him with shares worth about a million and a half at present prices. At one stage in the market he could have sold out his $253 stake for $35,000,000. But in addition Mr. Rentschler received $1,307,542 from United Aircraft in salaries and bonuses from 1929 to 1933, inclusive. The salary and bonus in 1929 alone were $429,999.

Philip G. Johnson, president of United Air Lines, the operating company of United Aircraft, gets a salary of $73,000. (Last fall there was trouble with the pilots over wages and hours.) Pratt and Whitney, a subsidiary of United Aircraft that sells airplane engines to the government, paid dividends from 1928 to 1932 of over ten million dollars.

Senator Black asked Mr. Rentschler: "If you had not got the $40,000,000 for carrying the mail, is it your judgment that salaries and bonuses amounting to over $400,000 a year to one man could have been paid?" "Possibly not," was the answer.

George J. Mead, until last June vice-president of United Aircraft and Transport Corporation, received in salaries and bonuses since 1927 the sum of $499,324, and by an investment of $207 in stocks of the United's financial family realized a profit of $7,800,000. William E. Boeing, chairman of the board of United Aircraft and formerly head of Boeing Air Transport, now absorbed in United, testified that Boeing Air Transport made a profit for 1930 of $1,488,306 on a capital of $750. A larger earlier capitalization has been paid off out of profits. Regarding the 1930 profits, Senator Black asked: "Derived from a Post Office contract exclusively?" "Yes, sir," was the reply.

Stockholders who have become excited over the government's action in canceling their companies' air-mail contracts were apparently unconcerned when the management of the companies threw away money in various operations of aggrandizement and in high fees to lobbyist lawyers and sons of Senators. American Airways (Aviation Corporation of Delaware), in order to remove competition, paid a rival $1,400,000 for a property that was admittedly worth only $700,000, and as a part of this same deal Western Air Express bought 20,000 shares of its own stock, which was held by Aviation Corporation, at $55 a share when its market value was only $20.

The record of the Senate committee hearings is shot through with material like the examples given, and contains abundant evidence of the control by a few big combinations of air-transport companies and all other departments of the aviation industry. Those who are shedding tears for the concerns that have lost their air-mail contracts are lavishing their pity for the most part on aggregations of people who have made stupendous profits out of the government and the public.

Those who credit the cry that the companies had no opportunity to be heard are simply being taken in. Not only did they have the chance to present their case along with the questionnaires, but every witness who desired to do so was permitted to file a statement at the time he testified. Not only that, but two members of the committee, Senators Austin of Vermont and White of Maine, have at all times shown themselves both eager to defend the representatives of companies with questionable contracts and hostile to witnesses giving damaging testimony.

If anyone expects the aviation manufacturers and operators to have mended their ways in dealing with the government, he is doomed to disappointment. The investigations have not taught the air companies a single thing. Support for this view is contained in the monthly market letter of J. W. Bowen and Company, brokers, of Boston. Their market letter reads, "When the air-mail contracts are relet to the operators, the aviation industry will be in a position to continue its temporarily interrupted progress. . . . That further progress will develop seems assured." It is pretty clear by now that "progress" in aviation means outrageous profits at the expense of the taxpayers. Is there an Air Trust monopolizing the aviation industry? Says the market letter, "If three companies now getting three-quarters of the business are assumed to get 100 percent in the future, and further that no additional capital will be required, then this $32,000,000 (estimated 1934 earnings) will be divided among 8,350,000 shares, the present capitalization, or less than $4 per share." This is a polite way of inviting more people to try to get their feet in the government-subsidized aviation-trust trough.

And then there is Mr. Cord. As rebidding for the mail contracts draws nearer and the terms of Postmaster General Farley's plan for reorganizing the service are more closely studied, Washington observers are beginning to wonder whether the net result of the Senate investigation will really be the purification of the air mail or simply its monopoly by Mr. E. L. Cord. The Post Office refuses to comment on Cord's eligibility to bid for the new contracts, but the fact remains that of all the great air companies only Cord's seems easily able to comply with the rules laid down by Mr. Farley.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For instance, Cord's American Airways handled about 28 percent of the total air-mail business, but handled it on contracts granted before Cord gained control. Its present officers, therefore, are now nearly all men placed in charge by Cord and so not involved in the collusive bidding that caused the cancellation of the old contracts and is to estop bidding on the new. Even if the stigma of collusion does stick to American Airway's corporative identity, Cord holds in reserve Century Airlines, an organization that flies no ships, does not hold and never has held mail contracts, but is perfectly capable of being a shell into which all American Airway's machines and personnel can be transferred.

Incidentally, since the cancellation of the contracts on February 9, American Airways, instead of restricting its activities, has been expanding them. Possibly it has expectations. KEITH HOWARD.

Roosevelt and the Power Problem

AS GOVERNOR of New York and as presidential candidate, Franklin D. Roosevelt laid down principles of action that were a sharp advance over the methods by which President Theodore Roosevelt, champion of the conservation movement of his day, sought to bring the electric utilities under social control. This advance was forced by the successful resistance of the utilities to effective state regulation and by their practical nullification of the Federal Water Power Act during the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover regime.

For years a last-resort method of the utilities in blocking regulation by state commissions has been appeal to the federal courts. Said the Governor to the Legislature: Please memorialize the Congress to restrict the jurisdiction of federal judges in purely state matters of this sort. It did, but Congress has not yet acted.

Through the device of the "holding company," interstate in character, the utilities had evaded state authority and issued billions of fictitious securities. Said the presidential candidate: We must have a federal law requiring tangible assets back of every dollar's worth of stocks and bonds. But the thing that most strongly arrested public attention and enlisted support in the campaign was the pledge to establish federal "yardsticks," that is, public power systems, which would be self-sustaining and demonstrate what an honest rate schedule might be like.

The public had observed that this kind of regulation by competition had got actual results in several cities and they believed it practical. In his Portland, Oregon, speech on September 21, 1932, Mr. Roosevelt summarized the broad outline of his proposed power policy as follows:

> I do not hold with those who advocate government ownership or government operation of all utilities. I state to you categorically that as a broad general rule the development of utilities should remain, with certain exceptions, a function for private initiative and private capital. . . . But state-owned or federal-owned power sites can and should properly be developed by government itself. . . . The next great hydro-electric development to be undertaken by the federal government must be that on the Columbia River.

Hence the candidate promised to strengthen regulation by federal law and planned a major federal yardstick for each section of the nation. In addition, he would give friendly encouragement to minor local public plants whenever the people, dissatisfied with the rates and behavior of private plants serving them, desired to undertake a construction of their own. There follows a brief account of what has so far been done to put this policy into effect.

When Mr. Roosevelt entered the White House, Muscle Shoals had long been built, but Congress had not decided what to do with it. Boulder Dam was under construction and the St. Lawrence project was awaiting Senate approval of the necessary treaty with Canada. Though the Columbia River projects were merely being talked about, Roosevelt had given very definite pledges for their construction and almost the first allotments of money for power were those for the development at the Grand Coulée in Washington and at Bonneville, Oregon, some forty-five miles east of Portland, both on the Columbia River.

The Bonneville project will provide a barge canal around the gorge in the river at that point and a large power plant. The initial installation will produce 86,000 horse power of electric energy and for this $20,000,000 has been allocated. The power house is being built large enough to accommodate added generators as needed. The ultimate installation will be 430,000 horse power at an estimated cost of $41,000,000. The engineers expect to complete the work now in hand in three years.

The Grand Coulée development near Wenatchee in central Washington will provide a power plant of 700,000 horse-power capacity when fully developed. The ultimate cost will be $63,000,000 and the first allotment of $15,000,000 has been made. The government is attempting to purchase the necessary land but is finding difficulty, and condemnation proceedings may be necessary. The survey and engineering plans and specifications are being rushed and will be ready shortly, whereupon active work will begin, giving employment to 4,500 men. Neither project provides for irrigation.

The President's message urging adoption of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the St. Lawrence treaty—since rejected—contained some new information of great value on generation and transmission costs. Citing recent reports of the Federal Power Commission and the New York Power Authority, he disclosed that by conservative estimates

> . . . the total cost of St. Lawrence power delivered at the end of the 300-mile transmission line [New York City] would be 4.20 mills [per k.w.h.] at 60-percent load factor and 3.13 mills at 80-percent load factor. The corresponding figures for delivery in the Utica area would be 2.99 mills at 60-percent load factor and 2.24 mills at 80-percent load factor.

Revenues so based would amortize the $89,726,000 investment in forty years, provide depreciation and pay all costs. Add one or two cents for distribution, and you get an average of three cents or less per kilowatt hour to householders utilizing St. Lawrence current.

As to Boulder Dam, $22,800,000 has been allotted by the Public Works Administration to the city of Los Angeles for the construction of a transmission line on which over a thousand men are now at work. It is expected that the project and line will be completed in 1935, Southern California then receiving Boulder Dam current.

The progress of the great power development at Muscle Shoals The New Republic has already described in detail, *e.g.*, December 27, 1933, and January 31, 1934.

But the President in his determination materially to increase the use of electricity in the American home has gone beyond the promises of the candidate. The high cost of electric appliances, as well as the high cost of current, has militated against large consumption. Recently, by executive order, the President created the Electric Home and Farm Authority. The Authority has projected plans, too extensive to be described here, that will materially reduce the cost of many standard home and farm appliances, not only in the Muscle Shoals district but throughout the nation.

The President's individual initiative has given a constructive turn to the old quarrel between the operating companies and the manufacturers of electric ranges, irons, refrigerators and other devices. The manufacturers have said, "Lower your rates and we can sell more appliances. This will also increase your load." The power men have replied, "Our rates are no higher in proportion to cost than your appliances." Neither would yield. But now that public competition is forcing lower and still lower rates, the manufacturers are setting their research men to work devising appliances that will give better results and use less current. The combination of these two trends will go far toward realizing the dream of an "Electrified America."

Radical changes have been made in the personnel of the Federal Power Commission, with the result that a real start, which should have taken place ten years ago, has been made in the administration of important provisions of the Federal Water Power Act. Take, for example, the epochal decision handed down by Chairman McNinch in fixing the actual cost of the Ohio Falls project under lease to the Louisville (Kentucky) Hydro-Electric Company—a Byllesby concern. The company claimed a cost of $7,829,738. The Commission allowed $6,996,093. In denying this padding, typical holding-company practices were scathingly exposed.

Among other activities, the Commission is making a new survey of our national power resources and electric distribution costs. This is likely to yield pay dirt, and promptly. The national power bill may be divided in half, the first half paying for generation and transmission, the second for distribution. Yet practically nothing is known concerning the actual cost to the companies of this latter half that is nearly all paid by the small consumers. When the Power Commission gives us the facts on distribution costs the last barrier in the struggle for fair rates to domestic consumers will have been removed.

As yet the administration has not moved in the direction of federal legislation regulating holding companies. It is a fundamental issue, but not so simple to remedy as might appear. We are now ready to admit that our efforts to regulate the power industry through state commissions have failed largely because of the holding company operating on an interstate basis. Delay in tackling this formidable issue may be due to a growing perception that a federal regulatory statute as hitherto conceived might not remedy the situation.

We may well ask whether an effort so to regulate the hodge-podge of large and small operating and holding companies sprawling without rhyme or reason or planned economy over forty-eight states would actually get us anywhere. We are approaching the point where regional control of an emphatic character, such as suggested in the Giant Power Report for Pennsylvania and since adopted for Great Britain, is necessary. The public-works allotment to the Power Commission for a study of our power facilities and their relation to the future will clarify this problem and focus public attention on it.

In his management of the Public Works Administration, Secretary Ickes, against great opposition, has courageously stood for the right of municipalities to receive funds for the construction or extension of their own utilities. Thus far, thirty-one cities and towns have received such aid. Perhaps the only serious omission has been that of Seattle.

Frederick W. Taylor, of scientific management fame, was wont to emphasize the importance of one eminently successful enterprise in contrast with a score of unrecorded mediocrities. Seattle's municipal power development is one of the best examples of public ownership in America. The city needs money to complete its famous Skagit development which it could easily raise if it were not for the depression. It is hoped the administration will yet

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

find some way to meet this obvious obligation. The hullabaloo raised by the power trust, which claims that the government is encouraging unfair and dangerous competition by aiding public plants, is somewhat ridiculous. Why does this twelve-billion-dollar industry so fear a few more foot rules?

Framing an N.R.A. code for the electrical industry produced a spirited contest. The Edison Electric Institute proposed a code the administration of which would have been in the hands of its members, thus placing them in authority over all public power enterprises, federal or municipal. This was rejected. They then offered a compromise, seemingly at the price of agreeing to any code at all, that the public plants be invited by the President "voluntarily" to come under the code. This feature, together with very unsatisfactory labor provisions, brought a strenuous protest from the Federal Power Commission, the Department of the Interior, organized labor and various nationwide municipal and progressive organizations. They declared it was too much like asking the lamb to lie down with the wolf, and pointed out that the Edison Electric Institute, despite its promise of reform, continues the objectionable practices of the old National Electric Light Association in its hostility to all public power enterprises and to adequate regulation. As a result, the municipal plants have remained outside and the code as proposed extends only over hours, wages and working conditions of privately owned plants.

Doubtless no one would admit more readily than the President himself that the administration's power program has not been fully advanced. But of this as of many other major problems which press for solution in this bewildering time he would cheerfully say, "We have not arrived, but we are on our way." There has been no retreat and no serious blunder, and the concrete achievements of the past year constitute a turning point in American utility history.

MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE.

Three Types of Poetry: III

IN THE opening remarks to these essays I set forth two propositions about poetry. I will now ask the reader to examine a little more narrowly the second, in the attempt to discriminate between a poetry of the will and a poetry of genuine imagination. We have seen that the poetry of the will takes two forms. There is the romantic and disillusioned irony of Shelley, or for that matter of a poet like Mr. Robinson Jeffers; there is the crude optimism of a Victorian like Tennyson, a moral outlook that has almost vanished from poetry, surviving today as direct political and social propaganda. My second proposition was a brief commentary on the lines by Shelley:

> Life like a dome of many-colored glass
> Stains the white radiance of eternity.

The will asserts a general proposition about the whole of life, but there is no specific, imagined context to support the assertion. (It is neither here nor there that the "idea" is a result of Shelley's reading in Plato.) As a product of the imagination the passage is incomprehensible; as a practical, that is to say, as a scientific generalization, it is open to the just contempt of the scientific mind. What, then, is the exact purpose and function of such poetry?

In purpose this kind of poetry competes with science; as to function it has, quite simply, none. It is an affirmation of the will in terms that are not a legitimate vehicle of the will. The proper mode of the will—proper, that is, in efficiency, but not necessarily in morals, for the question whether the will should be so expressed at all is a distinct problem—the right mode of the will is some kind of practical effort adequately informed by exact science.

Most modern schools of criticism assume that all poetry is qualitatively the same as the lines by Shelley; they assume this negatively, for the positive assumption is that poetry must of necessity be like science, a quantitative instrument for mastery of the world. This is the interesting theory of Mr. I. A. Richards: because poetry is compacted of "pseudo-statements" it cannot compete with "certified scientific statements," and must be discredited as science moves on to fresh triumphs. This point of view is doubtless inevitable in a scientific age; but it is not an inevitable point of view.

Mr. Richards' theory of the relation between poetry and beliefs about the world appears novel to some critics. It is the latest version of the allegorical, puritan and utilitarian theory of the arts—a theory that is rendered, by Mr. Richards, the more plausible because it seems to give to the arts a very serious attention. The British utilitarians, a century ago, frankly condemned them. So, with less candor, does Mr. Richards: his desperate efforts to make poetry, after all, useful, consist in reducing its subject matter to nonsense, and salvaging from the wreck a mysterious agency for "ordering our minds." Poetry is a storehouse of ordered emotional energy that properly released might re-educate the public in the principles of the good life. For brevity, I paraphrase Mr. Richards; it should be observed that the idea is set in terms of the will.[1]

Yet there is, even according to Mr. Richards,

[1] My discussion is based upon Mr. Richards' two principal books: "The Principles of Literary Criticism" (1924), "Practical Criticism" (1929).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

little hope for this kind of education. The "certified scientific statements" about the world make the metaphors, the images, the symbols, all the varieties of "pseudo-statement"—similes like the dome of many-colored glass—look extremely foolish, because in the exacter light of science, they are patently untrue. I do not intend here to discuss this theory as a whole. One part of it, I believe, may be dismissed at once. How can poetry, a tissue of lies, equip the public with relevant responses to an environment? They are a kind of response that is eminently practical; they must work; and this means that they must be, in at least a provisional sense, scientifically true. What is this mysterious emotional function of poetry that orders our minds with falsehood?

Mr. Richards is, I believe, really talking about the unstable fringe of emotion that I have called romantic irony: we have seen that this is what is left to the poet—a lugubrious residue—after he realizes that science is truth and that his own fictions are lies. This residue organizes and orders nothing whatever. Mr. Richards' underlying assumption about poetry is, like Mr. Edmund Wilson's, embedded in the humanitarian mentality of the age, where it lies too deep for examination.

If the pseudo-statement is motivated by the will (the only intention for it that Mr. Richards can conceive), it is false, and Mr. Richards is right: the poet of this sort expects potatoes to grow better when planted in the dark of the moon. If, on the other hand, a genuine poet uses the pseudo-statement, it is neither true nor false, but is a quality of the total created object: the poem. It is the power to perceive this total quality that has almost disappeared from modern criticism. For all human functions are assumed to be necessarily assertions of the will. And Mr. Richards, like the romantic poet of the age of Byron and Shelley, sees that science has contrived a superior instrument of the will; again like them, he tries to rescue poetry by attributing to it functions of practical volition, functions that he cannot define but which, in the true liberal tradition, he merely hopes for in some realm of private assertion against the "truths" of science.

Now it seems to me that the foundations of poetry, and possibly of the other creative arts, are somewhat different. We cannot understand them until we shall have eliminated from our thinking the demands of the category of will with its instrument, the practical intellect.

Let us look at Mr. Richards' famous terms: "certified scientific statement" (science) and "pseudo-statement" (poetry). I will try to show briefly that, for poetry, the certified scientific statement is the half-statement. The pseudo-statement is, as I have just said, neither true nor false, but a feature of the total quality of the poem. The lines:

> Out, out brief candle!
> Life's but a walking shadow; a poor player
> That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
> And then is heard no more . . .

are certainly not "true": we know that life is not a shadow, it is a vast realm of biological phenomena; nor is it a player. Neither are the lines false: they represent a stage in the dynamic unfolding of Macbeth's character, the whole created image of which is the whole play of "Macbeth," which in its turn is neither true nor false, but simply *exists as a created object.* All the pseudo-statements in the play, representing the conflict of will that forms the plot, are neither approved nor disapproved by the poet; that is to say, the poet neither offers us a practical formula for action nor rejects any of the volitional purposes of the characters; he creates the total object of which the pseudo-statements of the will are a single feature, and are therefore neither true nor false. What Mr. Richards' theory (and others like it) comes down to is the uneasy consciousness that such a passage as I have just quoted does not tell us how to keep out of the sort of mess that Macbeth got himself into. The historic connection of the theory with the traditions of moralistic allegory, which is the background of the modern poetry of will, is quite evident.

In order to develop the notion of the certified scientific statement as the demi-statement, a further point of Mr. Richards' theory must be noticed. Poets being ignorant of science and their general ideas false, they ought to write poems in which appear no beliefs whatever, but in which, presumably, there is that mysterious ordering of our minds. "The Waste Land," a poem that Mr. Richards' excellent taste leads him to admire, is such a poem—supposedly. But is it? According to its author and to my own simple powers of inspection, it is full of all kinds of beliefs. Mr. Richards, with admirable aplomb, has seized upon a poem in which large generalizations do not appear, as an instance of his theory: that poets, to keep our respect, must order our minds without lies; that, in order to avoid saying wrong things, they must say nothing. And this "nothing" is only another species of demi-statement. It leads straight to a defense of the recent school of "pure poets" in France, a school that had its meeker followers in England and this country.

This demi-statement may be in the pure poets an immersion in the merely sensational phase of experience. But in the older romantics of the nineteenth century, it is the domination by the abstractions of science. And indeed both fallacies of the creative spirit are due to a misunderstanding of the exact nature of the "certified scientific statement." We saw, in the second of these papers, how the romantics revolted from science, or one kind of demi-statement, giving us romantic irony. This irony has dwindled, in our day, to the other demi-statement (to the other activity of the same will) of "pure poetry." It is significant that at the present time we get, from both scientist and pure poet, a renunciation of all poetry because it cannot compete with the current version of our objective world, a version

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is preëmpted by the demands of the will with its certified scientific statements.

It must be remembered that this kind of statement is invariably, and on principle, the demi-statement. It is the statement about a thing, a person, an experience, which relates it to something else, not for the purpose of giving us knowledge of the thing, person, or experience in itself and as a whole; but simply to give us, in varying degrees depending upon the exactness of the science under which it is viewed, the half-knowledge that consists in control of its relations. If I feed a horse six ears of corn every day at noon, I may expect him to do more work in the afternoon than he would do without it. I am controlling the relation between grain and horse under the general proposition: Regular feeding of grain increases an animal's capacity to work. The statement must be either true or false.

But the statements in a genuine work of art are neither "certified" nor "pseudo"; the creative intention removes them from the domain of practicality. "In esthetics," wrote Mr. Leo Stein a few years ago in a remarkable book, "we have to do with complex wholes which are never in a rigid state of adjustment." This integral character of the work of art forever resists practical formulation. The esthetic whole invites indefinitely prolonged appreciation; whereas the demi-statement of science arrests the attention at those features of the whole that may be put to the service of the will. In the following verses the horse cannot be *used,* but as an object arousing prolonged contemplation in its particular setting it may be *known:*

> I set her on my pacing steed,
> And nothing else saw all day long,
> For sidelong she would bend, and sing
> A faëry's song.

The stanza is neither true nor false; it is an object that exists.

I think it ought to be clear by this time that theories like Mr. Richards', theories covertly or avowedly concocted in the interest of social schemes, are not guides to the study of the immense qualitative whole of works of art; they are scientific (more or less) charts, relating the art-object to other objects at the behest of the practical will. So it may be said that such theories belong to that perpetually modern impulse to *allegorize* poetry, to abstract for use those features that are available for immediate action, and to repudiate the rest. Because genuine poetry says nothing about action, because bad poetry says everything about it, but futilely, all poetry must be discarded.

It ought to be clear that this is the regular course of science in the whole universe of objects, and that with the arts science proceeds consistently, on principle; that society, also, has developed an instinctive approach to the arts appropriate to the scientific temper of the age.

A man lives in a beautiful house in a beautiful place. Let him discover oil under his land. The oil has been there all the time as a feature of the total scene. But he violates the integrity of the scene by "developing" the oil. Where the house and land had previously existed for his loving contemplation, he abstracts one feature of it for immediate use under the ægis of Mr. Richards' certified scientific demi-statements; and destroys its wholeness. Perhaps he was a different kind of man: suppose he had always meant to get out the oil, and had gone about it with an improper method. Suppose that all he could do was to write a poem, like the "Ode to the West Wind," in which he said: "O Oil, make me thy conduit, even as the earth is!" It would be a poem of the will, and Mr. Richards would have a perfect right to test the scientific efficiency of the assumption underlying the poem.

It is not with this kind of poetry, but with another kind that is not a poetry of the will, that I am concerned; and I have been chiefly concerned with offering a few commonplaces about its neglect by our advanced critics. Genuine poetry has been written in most ages—including the present—but it is a sort of poetry that was written most completely by Shakespeare. It is the sort of poetry that our "capitalist" and "communist" allegorists have forgotten how to read. When a Humanist remarks that Shakespeare merely presented life without interpreting it; when a Communist says that Shakespeare was a "capitalist" poet because, in his plays, the lower classes are shown as buffoons, we must remember that in each case we are being told precisely the same thing: that poetry is a document of evidence to be used by the social will.

What is the prospect of poetry in an age dominated by such a passion? It is no worse than it has been for the last hundred years. Perhaps it is better. The ambitions of the age of science have been checked, and it is likely that the coming era, after the interval of disorder, will provide a sounder notion of the totality of experience, in which the arts may have a better chance to thrive.

I have sketched some aspects of the poetry of the will, which in the last century and a half has taken two directions that I will summarize again. First, the optimism of science, either pure or social science, an uncritical and positive Platonism. Secondly, the negative Platonism of the romantic spirit, a pessimistic revolt of the individual will against the optimism of scientific will. The quality of volition is practical in each case. But for isolated figures like Landor and Dickinson in the last century, and a few today, the creative spirit has been shunted off into obscurity by the heresy of the will.

The quality of poetic vision that I have already in these essays named, with respect to the two forms of will, the middle ground of vision, and, with respect to itself, the vision of the whole, is not susceptible to logical demonstration. We may prepare our minds for its reception by the logical elimination of error; it is then an immediate intuition of the mind. But the kind of criticism that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dominates the intellectual life of this country is that of the French mathematician who, after reading a tragedy by Racine, asked: *"Qu'est ce que cela prouve?"* It proves nothing; it creates the totality of experience in its quality; and it has no useful relation to the ordinary forms of action.

Since in these papers I have not set out to prove an argument, but to look into arguments that seem to me to be wrong, I will state my point of view as briefly as possible: that poetry finds its true usefulness in its perfect inutility, a focus of repose for the will-driven intellect that constantly shakes the equilibrium of persons and societies with its unrelieved imposition of partial formulas upon the world. When the will and its ideas are put back into an implicit relation with the whole of our experience, we get the true knowledge which is poetry. It is the "kind of knowledge which is really essential to the world, the true content of its phenomena, that which is subject to no change, and therefore is known with equal truth for all time." Let us not argue about it. It is here for those who have eyes to see.

ALLEN TATE.

Washington Notes

The Costly Holiday—Confused or Complacent—A Little Friendly Sniping—Lippmann Lectures—All Aboard for Ballyhoo

THERE are a few things that should still be said about the smashing defeat of Mr. Roosevelt in the vote of the House and Senate overriding his veto of the Independent Offices Bill. (The bill as passed includes about $112,000,000 more, it is estimated, for both veterans and federal employees than the President wanted.) A change of three votes would have turned defeat into a victory and Mr. Roosevelt might have saved himself in two ways. Instead of the refined, complacent and mild message that he sent with the veto, a genuine fighting appeal with a ring in it would probably have been effective. That was one thing he could have done. He also could have postponed his holiday for one day and thrown his own personality into the fight. Hardly anyone doubts that either of these courses would have turned the trick. That both of them would certainly have resulted in a sustained instead of an overridden veto seems beyond dispute. Failure to do either raises the question whether Mr. Roosevelt was misinformed about the situation or merely was too complacently confident.

As to the effect, there is, of course, a certain loss of prestige. There is also an additional problem for the Treasury to raise another $250,000,000 for operating expenses, though there should be no serious difficulty about that. And there is the effect upon the rest of the administration program pending in Congress. Undoubtedly, the opposition has been encouraged by the discovery that they have been able to beat the heretofore irresistible occupant of the White House without incurring sudden death The best judgment, however, is that, so far as the Democrats are concerned, the disposition will be to support the administration on other matters and treat the overriding of the veto as an incident in which Mr. Roosevelt just happened to be wrong.

In addition to his loss of prestige, the belief that he could manage Congress with his left hand has been dissipated, perhaps for good. This was, I think, so real a popular asset that until a few weeks ago every Democrat in the coming campaign was going to make his fight for reëlection simply on the plea of "upholding the hands of the President." This appeal is considerably weakened when 211 Representatives and 31 Senators, all good Democrats, go on record to override the President's veto. Of course there will still be a great many pious generalities along the hand-upholding line, but the plain and additional fact is that the people generally are not so wholeheartedly back of the President's policies as they were. Particularly is this true of the N.R.A., which is in even worse state of confusion now than it was last week. It is being criticized these days as sharply by friends as by enemies of the administration.

In making over his organization to correct mistakes and meet the indictments, General Johnson is using the same high-pressure methods he did before. For the first six months the General's objective was simple mass production of codes, pretty much regardless of the kinds of codes produced. One rather natural result of this was the creation of intolerable conditions under which both small independent business men and consumers were badly squeezed. Another result was the general recognition that the N.R.A. had failed and was retarding rather than promoting recovery. For a while the journalistic attack on the N.R.A. came largely from Mr. Hearst, The Chicago Tribune and The Chicago Daily News. In the Senate, the one powerful voice raised against its obvious abuses was that of Senator Borah. But within the past few days fire has been opened by no less a person than Mr. Walter Lippmann, who certainly cannot be considered unfriendly to the New Deal program or the men operating it. Speaking with all kindly feeling, Mr. Lippmann thinks that while the General "wins battles on fifty sectors," he is in "grave danger of losing the war." The war that Mr. Lippmann means is the one against industrial anarchy, which it was the task of the N.R.A. to win by working out a system of constitutional government in the basic industries. The sensible thing to do now, he thinks, is to concentrate on the steel and a few other important codes with the aim of revising them to restore competition and establish a system of collective bargaining. With the great mass of minor codes, he thinks the best thing would be to regard them as temporary, due to expire in the near future except where an industry really needs a code, wishes one and means to comply with the social ideals of N.R.A. Such a criticism by Mr. Lippmann is far more significant than any from either Mr. Hearst or the Republican journals of Chicago. In essence, Mr. Lippmann's recommendation is to rebuild the N.R.A. till it can be efficiently managed.

But General Johnson has no such plan, has given no hint of anything like it in his reconstruction program. On the contrary, the General is howling for high speed in the revamping of codes and the remodeling of his organization. He has switched and shifted officials, set up new boards and commissions, given out more statements and kept

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

things moving at a lively pace. But it mostly amounts to running in circles and rapidly getting nowhere. It is reported that he is preparing another Big Blue Eagle ballyhoo campaign. The old expert who worked out the Liberty Loan publicity drives during the War and managed things for the General last year during the first furious Blue Eagle propaganda is back at his desk again. The fundamental difficulty seems to be that the General never rids himself of the idea that he can put over his proposition simply by main force. It is all slightly discouraging.

Meanwhile, the A.A.A. is not having easy sledding. The Bankhead Bill for compulsory cotton-crop reduction, about which Secretary Wallace has voiced considerable misgivings despite its endorsement by the President, has passed the House but has been amended in the Senate in a way to make it utterly unworkable and even ridiculous. It is possible that the worst amendments can be chopped out in the conference committee, but it seems certain that this new direction in agricultural policy will have no auspicious start. It has been subjected to such heavy fire in the Senate by Borah, by Bailey of North Carolina, and by others, that it will not be received with any degree of favorable unanimity.

The bill has quite another political importance, for it is going to provide a real issue upon which an anti-administration campaign can be waged among the farmers. It was Borah who declared his belief that this compulsory policy—limited in the Bankhead Bill to cotton—in contrast to voluntary coöperation, would be extended to wheat, corn and other crops. This drift toward using frank compulsion is regarded by many as the most momentous step taken by the administration in the last three months. Certainly its potentialities are incalculable, and it is not surprising that Mr. Wallace urged more careful thought and more thorough discussion before the step was taken. Far-sighted and candid, Mr. Wallace sees the difficulties and some of the possible developments. Yet, it is also hard to see what other course the administration can pursue, and it looks as though the Bankhead Bill will pass—though in what shape no one can tell.

Nor can one now forecast the fate of the proposal to give the President power to make tariff treaties. In the judgment of Mr. Wallace, and of others in the best position to have a judgment, these powers are essential if the President is to make any permanent solution of the agricultural problem, Bankhead Bill or no Bankhead Bill. Yet, the opposition to the grant is strong, and some of the most conspicuous senatorial friends of the farmers are leading it.

All in all, events of last week, particularly the extraordinary breaking away of the Congress on the veteran veto, have added no strength to the remainder of the administration program. Perhaps, when he returns, the President may make another appeal to the public on the air. It is what his friends want him to do, particularly if there is a jam on the tariff proposal. But Mr. Roosevelt is very canny about these radio addresses to the nation. He has said he wants to run no risk of overdoing them, and will make them only when they seem demanded. There is good sense in that. T. R. B.

Washington.

Other People's Money

Propaganda de Luxe—"Telegraph Your Representative"—Marketing a Poke at the Market—The Lie of Statistics

THE SUCCESS of the automobile companies has, as we have been informed in the newspapers, emboldened the steel industry and others to intensify their warfare on the efforts of labor to establish itself on an equality of bargaining with employers. And the warfare referred to brings to the surface a kind of propaganda that goes on year in and year out and of which the general public hears very little. Talking one day not long ago with one of the leading publicity counsels in the country, I was informed that newspapers were becoming more and more unimportant in molding public opinion. The millions who own stocks and bonds in this country, he explained, who make up the substantial element of the population, are the people whose opinions sway government policy. It is simply necessary, therefore, to reach these people to mold their views. You need not worry about the papers. And the way to mold their views is to appeal to their pocketbooks. They can be reached through the mails and, frequently, at no extra cost for postage, by enclosing, in notices sent out by corporations to their stockholders, the little messages that the "molders" wish to put across. Most of the big corporations have been using this method in fighting the Wagner Bill, the Securities Act, the Stock Exchange Bill and other measures of federal or state importance. The following little letter, for instance, was received by the stockholders of a steel corporation:

> Every commercial firm in this country, regardless of its field, is vitally interested in the defeat of the impending labor legislation introduced into the United States Senate by Senator Wagner . . . and into the House of Representatives by Representative Connery.
>
> We call your attention to a reprint of an editorial from the first page of The Daily Metal Trade of March 17, 1934, enclosed, entitled: "Defeat the Wagner Labor Bill." This editorial clearly expresses our own views and, we believe, those of our customers and all others engaged in business and industry.
>
> To preserve and protect the welfare of both employer and employee under the equitable laws of the land we urge upon you to personally contact, if possible, or to telegraph your representatives in Congress to defeat both Wagner and Connery Bills.

Then follows the editorial referred to, which is, of course, a bitter attack on the bill. Perhaps the right of the managers of a corporation thus to use the facilities of the corporation for propaganda purposes may have to be challenged. As a matter of fact, the publicity and propaganda methods that have been in full operation against the Wagner Bill and particularly the Stock Exchange Bill would make a fine subject for inquiry by the Senate. The Senators would get an excellent laboratory exposure of the precise technique used by large corporations to bamboozle the people.

Is the Stock Exchange, or at least are its members,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acting to produce a serious decline in prices in security markets? For an instance, Harris Upham and Company, brokers, have sent to their customers a letter quoting at length a telegram received by them from Richard Whitney. The telegram concludes: "In my opinion, the practical consequences [of the Fletcher-Rayburn Bill to regulate exchanges] will be the disruption of security markets, deflation of security prices and the postponement of economic recovery." What can the sender suppose must be the natural effect of such an announcement by the president of the Exchange sent to a margin holder of stocks? Can it have any other effect than to induce him to sell? And if he sells, who will be responsible for the sale? Incidentally, who will collect a commission on the sale while the process of frightening speculators and investors goes on? This may or may not be a good time to sell, but whatever the answer is, the Stock Exchange Bill has nothing to do with it. The man who permits his broker, who is now trying to capitalize on his fright in order to save the Wall Street racket, to scare him into selling, is just a *plain fool*. If stocks go up or down, it will in the long run be the result of forces unconnected with the bill.

The newspapers give prominence to the figures on the increase of employment during February. Of course employment did not increase so much as C.W.A. employment decreased. But the important fact is that while employment in various consumers-goods industries increased, employment in the building industry decreased by 50,000. That is ominous.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

On the Labor Front

Just a Great Big Piece of Hope—Sinking the Boards—Uses of Coercion—Bandying with Bargainers

AS WAS to be expected, President Roosevelt has been widely acclaimed, especially in the conservative press, for his success in averting a strike in the motor industry. But no one seems to know—even after a week's close study of the "settlement"—precisely what its ambiguously phrased provisions mean. To The New York Times it is "a great piece of work," to the automobile executives it is in accordance with their "principles," and to the heads of the A.F. of L. it offers hope, though from the labor side a few discordant notes have already been registered. In the opinion of Matthew Smith, general secretary of the Mechanics' Educational Society of America, an automobile workers' union, the agreement is "a shabby joke," and another critic has called it the "Versailles Treaty of the labor war."

It is perhaps not too early to suggest that the President's compromise raises more questions than it settles. For its real import is that the administration has once more evaded a genuine showdown on its policy in the dispute between capital and labor. This action is highly significant. The motor industry has persistently refused to recognize the authority of the National Labor Board. It has repeatedly declared that it would not consent to an election to determine the real choice of the auto workers. Yet the Board and its elections represent the chief machinery provided by the administration to aid labor. Faced with the defiance of the manufacturers, President Roosevelt has sidestepped the issue and refused to back up the Board. Thus, in refusing to take a firm stand, the President has, to a considerable degree, vitiated his labor policy, as expressed through the National Labor Board.

What will now happen to the Board, to the plebiscites conducted by the Board, to Senator Wagner's Industrial Disputes Bill? It has already been suggested in Washington that the auto settlement is to be regarded as a precedent. If this means anything, it means that the Board is on the way out. There is nothing in the auto agreement that provides for the use of either the Board's mediation facilities or for its impartial plebiscites. In addition, it is noteworthy that the Board, though it intervened in the motor dispute, has remained silent and has, as yet, made no finding. It is industry's desire to have the settlement of labor disputes taken away from the National and Regional Labor Boards and placed under the N.R.A. proper—that is, in the hands of Code Authorities or Code Compliance Boards. The auto settlement is definitely a step in this direction—a step that is further emphasized by General Johnson's latest order directing all industries immediately to set up industrial-relations committees for the adjustment of labor disputes. These committees will be comparable to the automobile mediation board, and their decisions, though subject to a veto by the N.R.A., will, apparently be independent of the National Labor Board.

The bitter opposition of industrialists to the Board and especially to its policy of supervising plebiscites is understandable, since in a large majority of cases independent unions win the elections. For example, of 142 that have been held this far, 100 have returned majorities for trade unions. Even more interesting is the practical result of these elections: that 53,837 workers were placed in plants with trade unions and only 11,365 in establishments that voted against such representation. In short, 75 percent of the workers involved gained the right of collective bargaining through their own unions. And this despite the fact that in some cases—such as that of the Budd Manufacturing Company—the elections were improperly handled and resulted in victories for company unions when these were clearly not the real choice of the workers. Obviously, the manufacturers have a great deal to gain if they can force the discontinuance of plebiscites—whereby the group winning an election speaks for all the workers in a plant—in favor of proportional representation as provided for in the automobile settlement. As The New Republic pointed out editorially last week, proportional representation is a means for dividing, rather than uniting, labor.

In view of these developments, the outlook for the Industrial Disputes Bill is hardly promising. One of its chief purposes originally was to outlaw the company union. But it is now reported that Senator Wagner will modify his bill to conform to the President's automobile agreement in order to permit "free" company unions. He has also told the Senate Education and Labor Committee that he would consent to a general "softening of the measure." Since the bill had serious deficiencies in its original form, it can hardly be of great benefit to labor by the time it is revised. In fact it may be a source of great harm. Senator

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wagner has agreed that the bill should include a ban against "coercion from any source," whether from employer or employee. Such a provision would be a direct invitation to the courts—which they scarcely need—to prohibit strikes, picketing and the boycott as unfair "employee coercion." In the last analysis, these are labor's only reliable weapons. No bill intended to aid labor should contain any provision that can be used by unsympathetic courts to restrict their use. Rather, the bill should be strengthened to protect these rights. If this cannot be done, the best course would probably be to abandon it and try for one with real teeth at a later time.

Meanwhile, workers are becoming impatient of compromise and are taking collective bargaining into their own hands. In Haverhill, Massachusetts, 8,000 shoe workers have been on strike for more than a month. They have refused to call off the strike and submit the dispute to arbitration, despite the request of the Boston Regional Labor Board. The shoe manufacturers want the union, the United Shoe and Leather Workers, to sign a contract providing for compulsory arbitration of all controversies. But the union is opposed to this principle and will not return to work until the objectionable clause is deleted. Similarly, more than 3,000 striking shipyard workers at the New York Shipbuilding Company's plant at Camden, New Jersey, have refused to submit their demands to the mediation of the Philadelphia Regional Labor Board, and declared that settlement of the strike was up to Clinton L. Bardo, president of the company. Mr. Bardo has indicated that he is willing "to discuss the problems of the employees further," but the union has replied that it has "been discussing the situation for the last seven months and it is needless to have any further discussion." The workers want union recognition, pay of $1 an hour, and a thirty-two hour week. When these conditions are met, they will return to work. Some 3,000 knitting mill workers, employed by forty-five mills in Philadelphia, have also turned down a request of the Philadelphia Labor Board that they go back to work.

These tactics of labor, becoming more evident each day, are undoubtedly prompted by the highly unsatisfactory record of the mediation boards of the N.R.A. Confronted by intransigent employers, the boards have time and again left the employees stranded. Mediation officials are, of course, powerless, and when they discourage strikes they take away the most persuasive argument that labor has. This no doubt explains in large measure the critical attitude of Matthew Smith of the M.E.S.A. toward the mediation board in the auto settlement. For when this union, then representing 16,000 tool and die-makers, was on strike last fall, it was unable to obtain any real aid from either the Detroit Compliance Board or the National Labor Board. In The New Masses of March 27, 1934, there is an excellent account of the experiences of the M.E.S.A., during the strike and after. The article, based largely on stenographic records of the National Labor Board, describes the futile efforts of the Board to mediate. At no time was the Board able to force the motor executives (the same ones involved in the present dispute) to meet with and consider the demands of the union—though there was never any question that the union represented the tool and die-workers.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

Prejudice Purely

CRITICISM of dancing in America is in that fortunate young condition when there are as yet few dance critics, and no formulated standards of praise or blame but personal preference. Hence, without risking any abstract definitions between the difference in dance, gesture or motion, the following remarks on Miss Martha Graham as an artist are governed by purest of personal prejudice.

When one pays for a ticket to a theatre in order to see performed in front of footlights, framed in a proscenium, a recital of dancing, it seems fair to assume that one expects to see theatrical dancing. There are many other kinds of dancing, to be sure: folk-dancing, for example, which is not to be seen but to be done; or ritual or religious dancing, which is to be experienced in a more than spectacular sense. Theatrical dancing involves certain limits that give rise to necessary conventionalities or artificialities. The audience must be thought of, sitting with their eyes uptilted to the line which, in high-relief, is the dancer's plane or sphere of action. When such a dancer as Shan-Kar dances adaptations of East Indian ritual or folk dances, in the West, he theatricalizes them in order to save their impact across the footlights. Escudero's second and equivocally successful season was caused by his excessive purity of genre, his monotony of spectacle. The elements of theatrical dancing are surprise, glamor, brilliance and consistency within its chosen medium.

Every so often there comes on to the dancer's scene a personality sufficiently arresting to dispense with the ordinary canons of theatricalism, who can hold audiences by the specific weight of her inherent magnetism. These persons need no tradition. They are usually messianic and original. As usual, their "school" or "system" cannot survive the mortality of its creator. Such a dancer was Isadora Duncan, and such another is Martha Graham.

Miss Graham is not a theatrical dancer. Her admirers proudly assert she is more than merely that. If so, what is she? Or more blankly, what does she wish to convey? Is it movement, abstractly considered as being sufficiently beautiful in her own variety and ingenious composition? Miss Graham realizes that motion is not enough alone. Is it movement and gesture? Gesture must relate to a succession of basic ideas, of indications. What, to be short, is Miss Graham's subject matter? Her subject matter, as is the case with all originals, who are neither innovators nor traditionalists, is herself. It is by association also perhaps vaguely, herself as a particular sort of woman. It is the Pioneer Woman which an Oklahoma millionaire vainly tried to formulate in a competition of American sculptors. It is the wood-cut woman of a Lynd Ward vignette for Whitman. It is stark, earth-riven, gaunt, inward-eyed woman. It is not feminine, since it has neither amplitude nor richness. Although she has used a few men in her performances, it is impossible to imagine many doing her dances. Her girls, cleanly trained, are disguised, as nearly as possible, to look like Martha Graham, same grave mask, long hair, eyes focused inside their heads. She dances; one searches in vain for a better word, and they follow, in an invented vocabulary of gesture, abrupt, monotonous, repetitious as her music, which is of linear simplicity, an amelodic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continuum of cumulative hypnosis. Her jumps are jolts; her walk, limps and staggers; her runs, heavy, blind impulsive gallops; her bends, sways. Her idiom of motion has little of the aerial in it, but there's a lot of rolling on the floor. In her group dances there is achieved a rudimentary polyphony, a see-saw of asymmetrical counterpoint.

Miss Graham scorns make-up. One is never for a second allowed to forget this is Martha Graham. Those girls are Martha Graham's group. Her long pale mask, her deep eyes, her expression half between pain and foetal blindness, has the ambiguous, frightened humor of an idiot's games. This ambiguity is chronic. In her last concert, for example, she so failed theatrically that an ironic dance was seen to be humorous only after it was over. Then the audience, not to be caught off their guard a second time, laughed all through the rest of the program, regardless. Yet when during her number, and it is nearly always the same number no matter what the program calls it, in which a boy's unsteady voice spelled out *bee are ee ay dee,* no one laughed, nor was this curious lapse of awareness even mentioned in the criticisms of her recital. It was as if a priestess had belched. The congregation more than forgave her: they did not hear.

Miss Graham's fanatic audience is always cited as the chief bulwark of her popularity. It is surely fervent and vocally loyal. Mr. John Martin has made excellent use of a word, *metakinesis,* which has an emphatic connection. Thus, one can become sympathetically exhausted after watching Miss Graham work. However, there are other considerations to be made about a *metakinetic* audience, too problematical for good manners. Even a dancer cannot be held responsible for her admirers. This audience is solid and limited, sufficient to fill a theatre the three or four times a year she appears. Does this constitute a following? This audience is static. Miss Graham's position does not shift from year to year. She neither influences the traditional forms of theatrical dancing, nor does she affect fashion in women's clothes, nor does she represent any older civilization to America, or America to Europe, as did another semi-priestess, Isadora Duncan.

Of Miss Graham's sincerity there can be no doubt. Of her personal modesty and hard work there is not one gainsaying voice. Yet where is the faith of which she is a prophet? Till now, there is none obvious except in herself, neither an expression nor an interpretation except of her own subjective limits, and a demonstration of the limits of those girls who have submitted themselves to her.

What issue is there from Graham? Has she affected the history of gesture, even as little as Dalcroze, Laban or Wigman? Can it be utilized to make masses of people enjoy dancing again themselves? One doubts if such a visceral, deliberate, subhuman and spasmic grammar can have any future except in its own silence. For, whence springs its impulse: What is its reason? In Isadora ebullience was its own reward. There was a difference when she came on the stage. She was not a mimic, but her characterizations of qualities and tensions were greater than the body she inhabited. Even with the Tri-color around her, it was more Rude's Amazon than a California girl singing the "Marseillaise." Miss Graham has been in Mexico, though it is not surprising that the Indians had little enough to offer. She is credited with knowing enough of the regimen of ballet to have consigned it to the hell of the orthodox. Yet when will she ever be as impressive as in the Chosen Maiden's dance in Miassine's partition of "The Rites of Spring," where he remembered what he could of Nijinsky, and how Nijinsky, instead of abandoning ballet, literally threw it over? It tossed like a coin, with the other face up, as sterling on one side as on the other.

Ultimately speaking, Martha Graham is another American "group dancer." Her superior concentration allows her to command a larger "group audience." Has it grown? Will it grow? Can her dancing be applied to others who are impervious to her personal appeal? Has any mode of dancing attached to a single name lasted longer than its inventor's theatrical life?

LINCOLN KIRSTEIN.

Early European Music

THOUGH it still appears extreme, Ernest Bloch's statement that the art of music has been decadent since Orlandus Lassus's death no longer seems quite so extravagant to us as once it did. This is the effect of the series of concerts of short pieces of the old polyphonic music now in progress under the direction of Roy Harris at the New School for Social Research in New York City. We had long known the era beginning about the end of the thirteenth century and concluding about the end of the sixteenth, rich in compositions almost matchlessly pure and intense in feeling and expression, free in rhythm and almost incomparably ingenious and thorough in workmanship. But the two memorable evenings in "Aladdin's Cave of Wonders" have beautifully enlarged and deepened our experience of the facts and our whole idea of music.

For, merely in point of scope, Harris's sensitively scholarly programs excel all individual past efforts to familiarize us with the unique treasures of the period dominated by the three Netherlands schools. They comprehend examples of the hitherto largely benighted contrapuntal pieces for instruments, wisely selected and reorchestrated by Harris himself; thinly textured thirteenth and fourteenth-century productions; and more densely textured fifteenth and sixteenth-century ones. The programs also exhibit various species of this early European art, such as motets based on a *cantus firmus,* complex canons and other intricate imitatory forms, and provide instances of secular and operatic as well as of ecclesiastical music. Together with works by such genial subjects of the dukes of Burgandy as Dufay, Ockeghem, des Près, Willaert and Lassus, they, furthermore, include compositions by the apparently scarcely less genial Englishmen Dunstable and Tallis, by the Frenchmen Adam de la Halle and Guillaume de Machout, the Germans Isaak and Walter, the Italians Antonius Romanus, Palestrina and the two Gabrieli, and the Spaniards Vittoria and Cabezón. Besides, the performances by the Aeolian String Quartet and the rest of Harris' associates were unusually fine.

Never has one seen a New School musical audience so enthusiastic as was the one of March 11. And it was discriminative. Despite the awkward manner of the presentation, its treat of what Harris is dubbing "medieval music" actually stands out as the revelatory treat of the year.

Oblivion of benefits will therefore not be thought the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause of the interruption of this account with a passing complaint about the name under which this neglected music has been reintroduced to us. Dissimilar as it is from the music of our own period—for it presents progressions in time almost bare of the experience of space afforded by modern harmony—much of it is none the less destined to recover its popularity. It lies closer to the efforts of the newer composers than does a lot of nineteenth-century music. Something is impelling our men to recapture the art of interweaving separate melodic and rhythmic strands so highly developed by the masters of the old contrapuntal style. And, since syllables rule the world, it is desirable that our rediscovered friends, these early polyphonic masterpieces, be started on their American careers under their own name. "Medieval music" they certainly, perhaps fortunately for us, are not. The year 1453 nearly bisects the epoch of their birth; and the detection of the Carolingian, Ottonian and thirteenth-century proto-renaissances has long since made historians advance the date of the beginning of modern times way beyond that of the fall of Constantinople. As far as its spirit is concerned, the music unquestionably belongs to the rebirth. It distinctly expressed purely human sentiments. Yet it shares its claim to the name of "renaissance" equally with the contrasting homophonic music produced by the Florentine reformers under the spell of the antique drama. "Early Polyphonic Music" would therefore seem to be its proper handle. Or, since polyphony appears to be the demonstrable European contribution to the world's musical forms, and since names with cultural references are useful, it might advantageously be called by the title of the present notice. PAUL ROSENFELD.

CORRESPONDENCE

Real Rights for Women

SIR. I hasten to express my commendation for your courage and real service in publishing the excellent article, "Wasting Women's Lives," by Helena Huntington Smith, in the March 28 issue of The New Republic. . . .

As Miss Smith points out, easy access to accurate birth-control information is the first step towards correcting the abortion horror in the United States. However, those who are stirred by her article to work toward correcting these deplorable conditions should follow through a step further. Even with free dissemination of birth-control information there remains the chance of an occasional pregnancy. One failure in a thousand—which is well above the average of success—is enough to cause tragedy and even death to the woman who feels that she cannot go through with the pregnancy. No man nor state nor church should have the right to say whether a woman should bear eight children or one child. Hers is the risk, hers should be the decision. Even in time of war a man is allowed to volunteer when he is to be sent on a mission where the odds for death are against him. To force a woman to take such a chance merely because she wishes to lead a normal life, and yet to maintain jurisdiction over her own body, is fantastic.

Women of the United States should use their voices and their votes to demand a change in the laws which would not only permit the dissemination of birth-control information but which would permit them to have abortions performed, when they found it necessary, by highly trained specialists, at first-rate hospitals, and for reasonable charges. This would not mean more abortions. Women have proved that they will have abortions when they deem it advisable, regardless of the awful risks now involved. (Incidentally, I should say that Miss Smith's figures on the subject were extremely conservative.) It would merely mean fewer deaths from septicemia and fewer years of invalidism following abortions performed by quacks and with improper care afterward.

EVELYN PIERCE.

Washington, D. C.

Anti-Fascist Unity

SIR: Several times you have given publicity in your columns to the "World Committee for the Relief of Victims of German Fascism." Now the name sounds inclusive enough. However, in all fairness to your readers you ought to state plainly whether this organization with a name presuming to speak for the universe is a non-partisan body representing and represented by the most important German anti-Nazi groups, or whether it is merely another disguise for the discredited Communist party of Germany. Will any of the money being collected now by Lord Marley and his barnstormers be used in aiding stranded Germans who are not found quite okay by the mentioned political outfit?

Brooklyn, N. Y. H. JERSON.

SIR: In reply to the inquiry made by Mr. Jerson, allow us to state that the "World Committee," the official name of which is "Comité International d'Aide aux Victimes du Fascism Hitlerien" and which is located in Paris, has branches in twenty-two countries, according to the report made here by Lord Marley. This, we presume, makes it somewhat "World" and "International."

This committee aids victims and children of victims, irrespective of political or other points of view and is not a disguise for any party. Lord Marley, who is the chairman of this committee, is a Socialist and is a member of the British Labor party. We take a keen interest in the last sentence of Mr. Jerson's inquiry. The phrases "Lord Marley and his barnstormers" and "political outfit" indicate a deep prejudice already arrived at and without waiting for the information seemingly so "sincerely" desired. Mr. Jerson claims the Communist party discredited. He now attempts to discredit this committee. Any impartial person would hold that he is discrediting himself. This lends aid to and is not a method of opposing the Hitler regime. Lord Marley has just completed a very successful tour of the United States for the benefit of Hitler victims. Why is Mr. Jerson so peeved about this?

ALFRED WAGENKNECHT, Executive Secretary,
National Committee to Aid Victims of German Fascism.

New York City.

Extracts from Letters

THE recent earthquake at Bihar, India, Dr. John Hayes Holmes writes us, resulted in the loss of 20,000 lives and an enormous and unknown total of injured. He is coöperating with Mahatma Gandhi in trying to raise a relief fund and will be grateful for any contributions sent to him at 26 Sidney Place, Brooklyn, New York.

Dana College, Newark, New Jersey, writes that through the kindness of Adelaide Schulkind and Margaret Bailey it has received the library of the late Forrest Bailey. The college will welcome into the collection as a memorial to Mr. Bailey any books which his friends may care to send.

Brookwood Labor College writes us that in April and May it will give a repetition of its road tours, presenting labor plays, skits, mass recitations and songs to union groups and unemployed organizations. Those interested are invited to write to Brookwood, Katonah, New York.

Mrs. Florence A. Milliard of Altadena, California, writes us to defend the reputation of Mrs. William E. Boeing, the aircraft manufacturer, who was described by John Dos Passos [in "Washington: The Big Tent," The New Republic, March 14] as not having been a millionaire "long enough not to feel guilty about it." According to Mrs. Millard, he has had plenty of time to get over any feeling of guilt, being "a man of great inherited wealth."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Might It Be Mountains?

WHEN Miss Stein wrote a description, for example, such as, "Might it be mountains if it were not Barcelona?" she started off at least one of the current arguments about "Four Saints in Three Acts." "But what does it mean?" turns out to be the high point in critical reaction from many a spectator, and will continue so.

It is obvious that the description is perfectly clear and gets its effect; it merely redraws the too often commonplace comparison and freshens the image. Anybody who can listen to that line without recalcitrant clarities, or honest determinations about making sense, will see the sense, very much as St. Augustine meant when he said he knew what time was if you did not ask him, or very much as a spring morning may mean something definite in terms of colors, breezes, words, odors and motion, something never more indefinite and inexact than it would be in words alone, especially the words one might be likely to afford it. But we will not get into that argument; it was whirling around Miss Stein (as much as she could get it to whirl) a generation ago. I may add, however, that what we choose to do about it still remains to be seen; and mention African sculpture by way of comparison. In this sculpture the human face, for instance, is regarded as made up of units, independently disposed and to be employed in the design as the designer wills—the nose above the eyes, the chin almost absent, or any other arrangement—the final and only reference being, of course, not the fact of a human face but the pattern of the piece of sculpture. In general, since she gave the push-off, so to speak, provided the characteristic esthetic, to the whole opera, and since she makes good publicity, it was a good thing to send out "Four Saints in Three Acts" as the Stein opera. But by putting the stress thus heavily on the libretto we have done most to disturb the minds, almost the consciences, of many about the whole event.

Now and then in the theatre an event serves to launch points or illustrations in theory. There are two of these in particular that emerge from this Stein-Thomson-Stettheimer-Ashton opera, four naughty saints, perhaps, in the one act of this production. One of these points is that for many of the serious-minded among theatre-goers the WORD remains supreme. This is a good thing in a way, since it is finally the written word that remains when the stage event is over, and since words have in themselves at times the virtue, and always at least the respectable pretense, of meaning something. The fact of our reliance on words nevertheless has many interesting connotations. It comments, for one thing, on the fact that we are a race that has produced great drama—mostly Elizabethan—but could not be said ever to have fecundated very profoundly the body or form of the theatre art as such. It comments, also, on Protestantism, which would inevitably arise with a race that understands less what the language of the Gregorian music expresses, or the universal, dramatic design of the mass, than it does "Jesus is a rock in a weary land"; or at least persuades itself that this is so, repeating words as if repeating what the words tried to express. If a man rushes at you with a dagger, what counts is not any word you have to describe it with, but the direction of his movement and the blood that spurts out of you, as Lucretius would say, toward the enemy that struck the blow. But to know where words count and where they do not count is one of the chief points of experience in the theatre art. There will always be people who would rather sit in the theatre and hear such an observation as, for instance, war is wrong, be not like dumb driven cattle, than to receive an accession of serenity that would, among many applications to life, make them feel war as a mockery of all stability and bonds of tenderness. This is because the mind in its almost habitual laziness tends to isolate itself and likes something portable and pat: whereas what is really art is alive, incessant and a part of our flesh.

The other point about "Four Saints in Three Acts" could be approached like this:

Suppose one were walking in a pleasant place with green shapes overhead—shall we call it a grove?—and there dropped to the ground an object of a shape that pleased, a color that charmed, an aroma that tempted, and a seeming assurance that this object must be tasted. Would it or would it not be foolish to keep asking what is this or what species does this belong to? It would be useful to know; but is this the object itself, or is it a name, a word, an explanation, even a thesis? Can anybody eat an explanation? Someone walking with you there says, might it be the song of a bird if it were not a *nespolo?* What is a *nespolo?* you say. Your companion meanwhile is biting into it with delight; whether you wait till the word is fitted on to the object, or bite into it, is your own responsibility.

On the solemn side we have play after play about such things as a professor's daughter who wants to escape to Europe and improve her music, a professor who joins the anti-war movement, an American business husband and his spoiled wife who wants something she does not get out of life, or a young married couple waiting for the husband to make good. The trouble with these plays is not what they are about. The trouble is that they go from outside in. If you take "Alien Corn," for instance, Mr. Sidney Howard's play in which Miss Cornell evinced such emotional conscience and profound boredom, you will see that it is all about nothing at all, because there is not anything created for it to be about. It is a curious fact, with regard to plays like this, that, whereas among dietitians nobody thinks of indigestions and acidities and invigoration unless there is at least a body and food involved, in plays like "Alien Corn" spiritual ructions and noble committees are posited on vacancy. The suffer from aboutness.

This may sound to some like a plea for art without sense, but it is really only an objection to sense without art. We have, in fact, constantly with us a whole mass of bourgeois serious theatre that has never been properly put in its place. Its stupidity is that it begins only where it has already ended or never existed at all. It is a mere good intention, a banality, a bluff, or a superimposition of form where there is no matter. Whatever lack there may be in the interpretation of life that "Four Saints in Three Acts" provides, it at any rate provides the life to interpret. The spell, invention and contagion of it blow about your cerebral and sensory responses as a garden blows before your eyes, ears and mind; so that in the theatre there is present and at your service the substance at least for adult pleasure.

STARK YOUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

The Victorian Tragedy [1]

WITH "The Victorian Aftermath" Mr. Esmé Wingfield-Stratford brings to a close his trilogy of studies of the Victorian Age. The period, as the author points out, properly begins with the reign of William IV, and ends with the death of the Queen in the midst of the Boer War, but his survey is extended to 1914 to cover the years which in contrast to those of the first half of the great reign may be called anti-Victorian. Mr. Wingfield-Stratford's method is discursive and suggestive, and his style animated. He draws his evidence from literature, especially the popular novelists such as Pierce Egan and Robert Surtees, from memoirs, reminiscences, personal recollections, anecdotes, Gilbert and Sullivan's operas, popular songs and the cartoons of Punch. He takes account of the dwellings of the Victorians and their churches, their furniture and decoration, their arts and amusements, dress and daily life. He is primarily a historian of manners and culture, forced in his later volumes to concern himself increasingly with politics, upon which national destiny more and more depended.

Without the philosophical background and firm economic foundation of M. Elie Halévy's history of the same period, he develops a thesis that goes to the roots of the Victorian tragedy, a thesis that was indeed the burden of the prophecy of Carlyle, Ruskin, Morris, Arnold. The Victorians were so greatly preoccupied with changing the human environment by industry, so complacent over the progress they saw in the application of machinery to life, that they neglected almost entirely the problem of the adaptation of man to this new environment, and failed to fulfill a condition which their own biological science might have taught them was essential to survival. "In the knowledge and control of man there was scarcely any progress."

Mr. Wingfield-Stratford's work is essentially the story of the dominance and decline of the middle class. The basis of its triumph was laid in the Puritan revolution of the seventeenth century, in the expansion of trade in the eighteenth, and in the machine industry of the nineteenth. Its position was affirmed politically by the Reform Bill of 1832, and consolidated with respect to the proletariat by the Amendment to the Poor Law of 1834, the Factory Acts, and the extension of the suffrage by the acts of 1867 and 1884; with respect to the landed aristocracy by the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. One of the striking phenomena of the century, scornfully lamented by Carlyle, was the abdication of the hereditary ruling class which had dominated the eighteenth century. Its descent into a Merovingian sluggishness Mr. Wingfield-Stratford attributes chiefly to the education of Eton and Harrow and to the immersion in sport—the pursuit of foxes and partridges and the running of horses. He adds truly that the cessation of intercourse with France during the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars condemned a whole generation of the aristocratic class to cultural sterility. Between 1830 and 1870 the middle class was England. It furnished all the greater figures that gave distinction to the Victorian Age. Its high mark of effective control of the destinies of the country was reached in Gladstone's first administration of 1868 to 1874. Then followed the Victorian Sunset. The brilliant personalities went out one by one like candles in the *tenebrae* service—Dickens in 1870, Carlyle in 1881, Tennyson in 1892, Gladstone in 1898. The middle class became self-conscious under the criticism of Matthew Arnold, and as its philistinism was diluted by culture it lost the energy which was conserved by that philistinism.

The strength of the middle class, like that of the Puritans of the seventeenth century, consisted in the confidence born of alliance with God, in a conviction of its own peculiar destiny as of men who accomplish things, in its self-respecting separation from a faineant aristocracy and a servile proletariat. When the middle class in its success went whoring after public-school honors, peerages and sports it lost this self-respect. When it became submerged in the mass suggestions of journalism it lost its identity. Its God, the Lord of Hosts, went crashing down before the impact of science. As in the days of the Commonwealth, the rule of the saints became dull. One of Mr. Wingfield-Stratford's keener observations is that "the influence of boredom on the course of history has never been sufficiently allowed for." It was the desire for excitement that brought Disraeli into power in 1874, and though Gladstone was returned in 1880, the ground had been spoiled. Liberalism, the political creed of the middle class, became increasingly compromised in Egypt, in Ireland, in South Africa, in the Continental Entente. Men had lost control of events. Neither the God of the Puritans nor that of the transcendentalists vouchsafed the miraculous heroes prayed for by Carlyle, and time was lacking for breeding them according to the recipe of Bernard Shaw. The Queen's diamond jubilee of 1897 was a threatening sunset followed by the aftermath of twilight deepening into the blackness of world war.

Mr. Wingfield-Stratford is an apologist for the Victorian Age. He resents the attitude of Lytton Strachey in writing off the assets of Victorian personality and exhibiting a ledger of bankruptcy almost from the beginning of the business. He defends the statesmanship of the Earnest Victorians in standing "however waveringly and with whatever lapses, for the idea that a nation itself is a moral being, that the obligations of honor, duty and principle are as binding on the many as the one." He sees, however, that the Victorian middle class, like the Church of Laodicea, pursued its ideals with resolution tempered by compromise. Its failure to recognize the necessity of adjusting human life and civilization to new conditions he finds one of "spiritual orientation," the lack of "such a spiritual revolution as alone could enable civilization to survive the results of a material revolution."

So far it is easy to agree with Mr. Wingfield-Stratford, but there is a more obvious conclusion to be drawn from his premises. The Earnest Victorians were lukewarm in the pursuit of their nobler ideals. In practice they were as a class desperately selfish. Even when the wisest of them pointed out that response to the environment of machine production must be a mass response, that the condition of the survival of the race is a sharing of the goods produced and a breaking down of the barrier between production and consumption, the Victorian middle class stood pat on its legal rights, as its descendants do today. It threw away the moral progress of the nineteenth century in order to

[1] Those Earnest Victorians, The Victorian Sunset, The Victorian Aftermath, by Esmé Wingfield-Stratford. New York: William Morrow and Company. 350 pages, 404 pages, 410 pages, respectively. $3.50 each.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

save the institution of private property by the degradation of the workers, and the structure of capitalism by imperialism and war. In this sense the Victorian middle class betrayed the industrial revolution, betrayed the progress in which it so greatly delighted.

And this betrayal was made by default not of intelligence but of good will. In the very height of Victorian prosperity John Stuart Mill pointed out that while production was limited by natural laws there was no such limitation upon distribution, which remained entirely within the sphere of man's intelligence. He added significantly that if a choice were to be made between the present economic order, with its multiform injustices, and communism, all the chances against communism would be "as dust in the balance." The maintenance of a system that prevents the adaptation of man to the environment that he himself has created may be attributed to failure of "spiritual orientation," but critics less urbane than Mr. Wingfield-Stratford will find shorter and uglier words. ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Looking at America

The New Pioneers, by James Remington McCarthy. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 343 pages. $2.50.

THE AUTHOR of this book had an excellent idea—so good that I am surprised several other people haven't thought of it. It was merely to go out and look at the New Deal in operation. Mr. McCarthy went from New York south to Florida, then up into the Tennessee Valley, down into the Southwest, out to California, up to Oregon and Washington, back across the northern tier of states all the way to New England. He talked mostly to plain people—farmers on farms, steel-mill workers outside the mill gates, passengers in long-distance buses. He got a lot of information in speakeasies (most of his trip taking place before liquor was legalized).

Mr. McCarthy found that the New Deal has made much less difference, in general, than you might suppose. He discovered a great deal of deep poverty, anxiety and distress. Only a few of his people seemed definitely affected by the altered conditions brought about through Washington's efforts: The two who remain in my memory are a traveling salesman who believed he owed his job to increased prosperity in the South under the textile code, and a farmer, very unhappy about being forced to move because his land, in the Tennessee Valley, would soon be under water in a government hydro-electric project. Perhaps if Mr. McCarthy had asked people more what they thought about Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal and all the three-initial projects, he might have presented a somewhat different picture. Being a good reporter, he let them talk about the subject everyone loves best—themselves and their own private affairs: their hopes of a job, or a better job, or of winning a fortune through some lucky chance. He calls his book "The New Pioneers," but the feeling it leaves in my mind is that there aren't any; that America has changed very little through going broke, and that the pioneering spirit of the nineteenth century, including the gambler's hope of a big killing tomorrow, is still doing business at the old stand.

There is very little formal radicalism in this book, very little talk of socialists or communists or even of the new fascist groups which claim such staggeringly large memberships. You perhaps come nearest to something new with the Middle Western farmers. Mr. McCarthy went out and talked with the farm strikers in Iowa, and found them angry and frightened, but thinking much more along Populist lines than those of Marxian revolution. Their chief concrete demand seemed to be currency inflation. While he was there, the violent aspect of the farm strike came to an end. It ended, says Mr. McCarthy, "just like that—without an ending."

I have a feeling that where there is hope in this book, it is local and private and individual hope, people expecting to do better by their own efforts; and where there is discouragement, most of it comes from Washington. This may be an illusion, however, caused by the fact that the people in the book who are conscious of Washington are mostly bankers and factory owners and business men, who always like to grumble about the government when they aren't being Pollyanna for Chamber of Commerce purposes. It is also possible that the random sample of the population interviewed by the author is too small to make any generalization safe. At any rate, I found the book interesting, suggestive and on the whole well done. Mr. McCarthy's mother must have been frightened by Sherwood Anderson before he was born, and it marked the child; but only in a few places is the Sherwooden mannerism really annoying, and now and then it helps cut through the formalities of interviewing to a deep understanding. B. B.

Summer Is Over

Salt House, by Hazel Hawthorne. New York: Frederick A. Stokes. $2.

"SALT HOUSE" is a novel that is very easy to read. It is delightfully written, and equally deft both in managing the two landscapes—the New England coast, all very bright and sandy and freshy with salty breezes, and the stifling streets, restaurants and apartments of New York in summer—and in managing the characters that so nonchalantly swim, loaf, get drunk, fall in and out of love in the course of its pages.

The book is the journal of one Judith, twenty-eight, a writer, and divorced, who is awaiting a rendezvous at Salt House with Philip, a painter, and who, since Philip is some days late at the rendezvous, gives herself quite casually to Rake, an attractive boy of nineteen. Later Philip appears, and she returns to him with only occasional divagations towards Rake. A hot month in New York alone with Philip wears affection thin. She goes back to Rake, hesitates again, and both Rake and Philip disappear from the scene, one bound for Greece, the other for Toledo. The summer is over. Judith, deserted, shakes herself free of the two loves between which she has been unable to choose, something like a cat coming in out of a rainstorm, and thinks "how instead of feeling rejected I felt powerful and content, and though the day lay behind me, unfulfilled and lonely, yet somehow it had been like music."

The book is dated vaguely by the presence of anecdotal truck drivers who like to talk about their experiences in the War, by the brief presence of two Harvard Humanists in white flannels, and by an untold quantity of home brew and raw alcohol. The characters are all ephemera, the froth of a violent, vigorous and probably fundamentally destructive civilization. They have nothing to do with the civilization that has produced them. They are concerned, and that not very deeply, only with their own emotions, whims and physical necessities. In fact they are all very like cats, amoral, amiable, individualistic, and Judith's great preoccupation with the idea of "living honestly" seems to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resolve itself into the simple wish to live unhampered by any tie, by any responsibility.

I find myself reminded, in reading this book, of Colette more than of any other writer, partly because of the catlike disposition of the characters, partly because of the deft and agile style, the fine and feminine attention to sensuous detail. But "Salt House" lacks the bite of Colette's best work, the businesslike attack and sharp evaluation of each situation. However charming, wistful and naïve, it is in summary a little lost. JANET LEWIS.

Seven Economists Dancing on the Point of a Needle

The Economics of the Recovery Program, by Douglass V. Brown and others. New York: Whittlesey House. 188 pages. $1.50.

THIS IS an examination of the New Deal by seven Harvard economists "who *are* economists, not politicians, and who know their science well enough to know that there *are* economic laws." Being certain of their premises, these authors see in the New Deal only "contradictory forms of 'class legislation'" inspired by "the bitterness of the formerly exploited groups, which leads them . . . to become in their turn exploiters of the 'capitalist' groups and of one another." It is rarely that seven men can deal separately with as many distinct phases of a complex situation and produce a unified whole. These authors, however, all hold that "the real economist's Utopia is now and forever laissez-faire" and so they all arrive at the same conclusion, that the New Deal is based upon "crooked theories of rationalizations of rival interests or political demands." Whatever inconsistencies there may be in these seven essays arise not from differences in point of view, but from the qualifications which follow every statement, so that it is often quite impossible to say whether the authors believe a particular policy to be sound or unsound.

While thus careful to leave an "out," the general impression conveyed in each essay is that the New Deal not only does not aid recovery but retards it. Relief at public expense of those without means of support "may well be the most important thing that can be done during depression" (followed by the usual buts and ifs); an extensive farm-mortgage-relief program is the most appropriate and efficient form of governmental assistance to agriculture (although the view is expressed in the same essay that the reason farm prices are out of line with the prices for industrial goods is that forced liquidation has not been carried so far in agriculture as in industry); public works—perhaps and provided; the loans to banks, insurance companies and railroads, the refinancing of home-mortgage indebtedness and the banking legislation are not mentioned; otherwise everything that has been tried is bad. The "purchasing-power mirage" is ridiculed. "Higher wages while millions are still unemployed . . . act as a brake on recovery."—"Sharing of work tends mildly toward an increase in costs and to that extent may be an impediment to recovery." The encouragement of collective bargaining will not help organized labor and it is doubtful whether it deserves to be helped. Code provisions for limitation of output "can result only in further curtailment of our already seriously reduced national income."—"To attack conspicuous individual financiers for doing in the boom years things that were within the game of high finance . . . is both pointless and unjust." All attempts to establish a parity between agricultural and industrial prices are doomed to failure. "Our analysis leads us to believe that recovery is sound only if it does come of itself, although . . . ".

The authors recognize that "our new order must be a realistic compromise between economics and politics"; but, in line with the teachings of Machiavelli and Hobbes—"the greatest names in the history of real political science"—they urge that all economic groups should recognize that it is to their mutual interest to practise "reciprocal restraint." Business must understand that the demand for radical action will not abate until dishonest and oppressive practices are curbed (although "it is dangerous to attempt too much just now in the way of such reforms"), while the "different groups in distress" should realize that the greatest obstacle to economic recovery is "the passion for reform that indiscriminately attacks, along with real abuses, the normal practices and gains of honest economic competition."

It is unlikely that this appeal to the ten million men who are still unemployed and the millions of farmers who face imminent loss of their farms to cease taking advantage of and wreaking vengeance upon the capitalist class will effect any change in their attitude. In all probability the principal use which will be made of this "candid and vigorous discussion of the New Deal" is that of furnishing quotations for attacks upon the Roosevelt program. It is most significant, however, as an able and well written exposition of the science of economics as it is understood not only by these seven Harvard professors but by many other professional economists. This is a science of absolute and unchangeable laws, derived deductively, which, as expressed by Sombart, the German economic historian, and translated by Nussbaum, "is closer to medieval scholasticism than almost any other intellectual activity in the modern world." Formerly this science was known as "political economy," but, as is clearly developed in the last chapter of this book, the modern scholastics hold that economics has nothing to do with the actual conduct or reactions of the groups which are struggling for power and advantage in the distribution of wealth. With such a conception of the science of economics it is not surprising, again to quote Sombart, that "in comparison with the natural sciences, the practical applications of 'scientific economics' have been few and incidental," nor that many of the advisers of the national administration in the present crisis are professors from other fields than economics, or economists whom the authors refuse to recognize as "real economists."

EDWIN E. WITTE.

The Frost-Bitten Age

City Harvest, by Margaret Cheney Dawson. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.

HERE IS a novel treating the age of frost-bitten, puerile and spiritless wisdom with a sensitive, tolerant pen, openly sympathetic and tender. The entire story is focused on New Year's Eve of 1932-33 in New York City. Each character is standing on a precipice of decision, willing and unwilling to make the first step toward complete inner decay. Alec Marsh, whose wife Carol is having a lover, accepts not only his inability to make their marriage more than a smooth, civilized arrangement, but also Carol's open rebellion. She, inwardly tossed about, wanting the substance of love, is indignant, defiant and humble. She turns to the lost plan of her life, daring to hope that she can finally find it with Alec. Kate, the wife of Dennis

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mallory who edits a one-time "splendid rag," fights against a multitude of barriers between herself and Dennis, while he, like a bright, gleaming blade, two-edged and dangerously delicate in texture, moves with his crazy friends from one fantastic adventure to another.

Though the story takes place at a time of social and industrial unrest, all the characters are totally unaware of external disaster. Though the stench of decadence has entered through the back door and fills their living rooms, they are running about on this night, to speakeasies and into one another's arms, yelling for moonlight and wisteria. So unsuccessfully have they solved their inner turmoils and hidden inadequacies that, their lives spent in fruitless endeavor, they suddenly on this New Year's Eve demand one last opportunity to fasten themselves to themselves, and step by step, through the course of the night and a half-dozen parties, are thrust inevitably back to the original confusion. This engaging and skillfully written novel makes excellent reading. EMMY BLITZSTEIN.

Two Spies

Britain's Master Spy: The Adventures of Captain Sidney Reilly, R. A. F., edited by Mrs. Sidney Reilly. New York: Harper and Brothers. 310 pages. $2.75.

Memoirs of a Spy, by Nicholas Snowden (Miklós Soltész). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 348 pages. $2.75.

AS THE jacket of "Britain's Master Spy" boasts, Sydney George Reilly probably *was* the greatest English spy. Despite the schoolboy rodomontade of his narrative, despite the bloody adventures he relates and his wife supplements, for the imagining of which an unhappy schoolboy would be sent to a psychiatrist in a settled country, his stories are undoubtedly true. Men and the times were like that in Russia at the end of the last decade and the beginning of this. Born of an Irish father and a Russian mother in St. Petersburg, this sanguinary romantic was in a position to make a fortune from munitions contracts for the Tsar's government at the outbreak of the War. Naturally, the revolution found him ready to enlist with "the forces of civilization" against the Bolsheviks, who were "criminals, assassins, murderers, gunmen, desperadoes." The British Secret Service took him on. He worked with Bruce Lockhart, head of the British Mission in Moscow, with Captain Cromie, the British Naval Attaché in Petrograd. Cromie delayed an appointment with Reilly by ten minutes and so lost his life in resisting an armed Bolshevik search which swept into the Embassy to discover the abundant proof of espionage in 1919. Wanted, Reilly disguised himself as an Armenian trader or a German merchant or a privileged official of the Cheka itself. Speaking perfect Russian, for a year or more he drifted in and out of the unquiet and half-starved Russian cities, organizing the hidden Whites, more resourceful than any. He attempted repulsive crimes in the name of the Deity and the old civilization; some of them he committed. He dealt with a German inventor of a poison gas that might wipe out the inhabitants of a city, Whites and Reds alike. That project fell through. He staked all his wits on a mass assassination at a meeting where both Lenin and Trotsky were to speak. The meeting was postponed. But his organization managed successfully the murder of Uritzky, the Petrograd Commissar. After that blow, the Cheka reorganized, and gradually the disguised White elements in its own ranks were discovered and disappeared. Slowly, romantic White terrorists, though numerous, proved feebler than the realistic Red ones. Traps lay thick in the paths of the Reillys in Russia. Reilly himself left to fight in the New York courts for his munitions commissions, to give melancholy news to the "irrepressible" Mr. Winston Churchill (whose letters are reprinted) of the welfare of Mr. Churchill's friends in the Russian reaction and to marry the widow of Haddon Chambers the playwright.

Some years later he was tempted, possibly by the Cheka itself, to steal into Russia for a last attempt against the Bolsheviks. Accounts differ as to his fate. Two, brought out by White spies, describe his murder. But in 1926 a piece of linen on which was written the pseudonym by which only the British Secret Service knew him was smuggled out of a Soviet prison. Or so one White agent avers. Mrs. Reilly believes he is alive today.

To pass from Reilly's story to that of Nicholas Snowden, a rather more courageous man physically, is to come with relief into professionalism from the grip of a bloody if talented amateur. Even the Austrian's hard military style soothes. None of Reilly's Napoleonic complexes drove him, and his translated English is not highfalutin. He was a small-town Austrian who became a secret agent because the pay was good. As a preparation, he studied in an Austro-Hungarian school for spies at the beginning of the War. His features were masked from his fellow students and theirs from him. Thereafter he saw the War crawling on his belly at night over a snow-covered No Man's Land. Or he drifted into a distant Russian munitions town to organize a secret corps. Having changed masters after the War to the government at Prague, he awaited the hangman's noose in a prison of his native Hungary. His photograph shows a hard face with the beaked Magyar nose and eyes that have looked into horror. Once he found the epitaph of his own brother by chance over a cairn of dead soldiers. Here he commits to paper a few sentences of human regret at the cruelties of war, then hurries on to describe the great day when Wilhelm II decorated him with the Iron Cross, First Class. An interesting passage outlines an international spy clearing house which is, no doubt, still active. The institution budded after the War. The secret services expanded after 1919 instead of shrinking, for, naturally, the greater the number of sovereign states the greater the need of secret services. By this system information was traded back and forth regularly between agents with the knowledge of their masters. A government parts with a moderately valuable piece of military information regarding its own activities for a more urgently wanted item from its neighbor. The veteran agents who manage these deals rarely lose their jobs. GRIFFIN BARRY.

Books in Brief

BIOGRAPHY

AUTHORS TODAY AND YESTERDAY, edited by Stanley J. Kunitz. *New York: The H. W. Wilson Company. 726 pages. illustrated. $5.*

This volume of biographies, and autobiographies, of prominent figures in the literary world of the twentieth century, illustrated with photographs of each writer discussed, is an effective supplement to "Living Authors," published in 1931. The present book fills a number of gaps in the earlier publication, supplying information not only about authors of "yesterday," but about writers now active who were not included in "Living Authors." The fact that most of the sketches about living writers in this volume are autobiographies contributed by themselves will probably enhance the interest of the book to many; the condensed bibliography of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

works at the close of each sketch adds to its value as a handy reference. Together, the two books provide a convenient and fairly complete library of general information about contemporary writers.

CHRISTINA OF SWEDEN, by Margaret Goldsmith. *New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 307 pages. $2.50.*

Miss Goldsmith applies the psychological approach to Queen Christina, seeking answers to the question that "has puzzled historians"—why, "despite her unusual talents, her inherited opportunity of becoming one of the great statesmen of her time, she accomplished nothing at all." We are reminded that the queen was definitely a Lesbian: her natural repugnance for marriage combined with an innate dilettantism to scatter her energies during her reign, and provided the master motive for her early abdication. Assuming doubtless that the unfavorable view of Christina's extravagant career has had sufficient airing, Miss Goldsmith tends to slight the consequences of her actions in favor of an explanation thereof. Her study will serve as a needed corrective to the tendencies toward moral adjudication and hedging observable in existing standard works.

RICHARD HENRY DANA: 1851-1931, by Bliss Perry. *Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 265 pages. $3.*

The life of the third Richard Henry Dana would be an ordinary "better-class" Cambridge life, were it not for the fine sense of perspective which the biographer has brought to it. Vistas of more restless, more talented New England generations give interest to the foreground figure. One sees a man who labored under the burden of a family tradition, and under a hard-driving compulsion, in his own words, "to set things right that are wrong." The wrongs or inadequate conditions that he set upon were generally local affairs of preparatory school, Harvard, the New England Conservatory of Music, the Charles River Basin. Of greater significance was his leadership in ballot reform and civil-service reform, for both of which he labored under eight Presidents. For over half a century, he rang changes upon the phrases of his Class Day Oration, of which Reform was the theme. But though Dana's story is told in all graciousness, it is played out on a minor key; for he was never satisfied with his achievements, and felt the burden of the past; and in his time the vitality of old Boston was failing. H. H.

Public Questions

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL INSURANCE AND MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION IN GREAT BRITAIN, by Helen F. Hohman. *Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 462 pages. $3.50.*

The passage in 1834 of the Poor Laws on the one hand and the Factory Acts on the other set in motion the two contradictory currents of social legislation which have marked the century-long struggle of the English working class for security and a decent standard of living. Miss Hohman's essay, which won first prize in the Hart, Schaffner and Marx Awards for 1928, is a full and factual record of the shifting fortunes of the working class in wresting from the state such social services as poor-relief, old-age pensions, health and unemployment insurance, and minimum-wage laws. The book is particularly valuable for its discussion of the gains and losses of the post-war years.

Religion

SCIENTIFIC THEORY AND RELIGION: The World Described by Science and Its Spiritual Interpretation, by Ernest William Barnes. *New York: The Macmillan Company. 711 pages. $4.*

This is one of the most comprehensive attempts in recent years to "reconcile" religion and science. The Bishop of Birmingham has here published the material originally given as the Gifford Lectures at Aberdeen in 1927-29; those inexperienced in this type of literature will be overcome by the amount of technical knowledge, scientific background and dialectical skill revealed in his effort to show that "behind the world, controlling Nature, is the

JOHN DEWEY'S
NEW BOOK
ART AS EXPERIENCE

The greatest of American philosophers rounds out his philosophy of experience with a notable and epoch-making statement on the place of art in the life of man.

THE NEW YORK TIMES says: "The most thoroughgoing, stimulating, sprightly brief for the "biological" side of art that we know of. His 'Art as Experience' will no doubt stand as a tribute to his alert mind, keen perception and vigorous pen."—*Dino Ferrari.*

PROF. IRWIN EDMAN says: "He has taken art out of the museum as he long has taken philosophy out of the classroom, and has illuminated with freshness and sympathy the way in which experience flowers into art."

$4.00

MINTON, BALCH & CO.
2 West 45th Street New York, N. Y.

"Impressive . . . fascinating . . . valuable"
THE NATION

REBEL AMERICA

AN INFORMAL HISTORY OF SOCIAL REVOLT IN THE UNITED STATES

By LILLIAN SYMES *and* TRAVERS CLEMENT

"As fascinating as fiction, as well documented as a doctor's thesis—as absorbing as an autobiography."—*The Nation.*
"A vivid panorama of the country's liberal and radical movements. Both as a historical document and for its literary excellence, it commands admiration and respect."—*N. Y. Times.*

$3 HARPER & BROTHERS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Creative Spirit to Whom we are somehow akin." The presentation of current scientific ideas, from physics to archeology, is conscientious and often admirably clear: trouble occurs toward the end, when the author is actually able to say that "standards of international ethics have steadily risen of late years, in part owing to the influence of Christian ideals." H. W.

THE SHORT BIBLE: An American Translation, edited by Edgar J. Goodspeed and J. M. Powis Smith. *The University of Chicago Press. 545 pages. $2.*

This decently made volume is an abridgement of the University of Chicago Bible, and proposes to convey casual readers over many "gulfs to the understanding and appreciation of the . . . development of Hebrew and Christian religious thought." It is fairly inclusive, omitting excerpts from only nine books; and restricts itself to the religious element to the exclusion of much good literature; the Song of Songs, the best of Job, some folk tales, and practically all of Ecclesiasticus. Arrangement is made with reference to chronological order, though not without the apparent inconsistency of considering the date of revision into present form before that of probable origin, and this, together with a natural brevity of excerpt, tends a little toward confusion. The text used is largely a reworking of the King James version in the interest of expunging certain minor archaisms and much of the poetry. "Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken," is rendered, without any attempt to lighten the obscure symbolism, "While the silver cord is not severed, Nor the golden bowl broken." The editors preface each selection with explanatory comment, but omit a general introduction. O. C. F.

Travel

ARCHEOLOGICAL TOURS FROM MEXICO CITY, by R. H. K. Marett. *New York: Oxford University Press. 130 pages. $1.*

In writing this brief guide, Mr. R. H. K. Marett, Fellow of the Royal Archeological Institute, has admirably fulfilled his purpose—"to describe, briefly and untechnically, the principal archeological sites which belong to the great pre-Spanish civilizations of Mexico and can conveniently be visited from Mexico City." The book is indispensable to travelers who wish to profit by their visit to Mexico.

Contributors

MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE is a consulting engineer who served as chairman of the Storage Section of the War Industries Board and is at present a trustee of the New York Power Authority. He is the author, among other books, of "Academic Industrial Efficiency," and edited the symposium, "What Electricity Costs," published in The New Republic Dollar Series.

ALLEN TATE is the author of two books of poems, "Mr. Pope and Other Poems" and "Poems: 1928-1931."

LINCOLN KIRSTEIN is an editor of Hound and Horn and the author of a novel, "Flesh Is Heir."

JANET LEWIS is the author of "The Invasion," a novel published last year, and of a book of verse, "The Wheel in Midsummer." She is now at work on a second novel.

EDWIN E. WITTE is professor of Economics at the University of Wisconsin. He is the author of "The Government in Labor Disputes."

EMMY BLITZSTEIN, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, is at work on a novel.

GRIFFIN BARRY was correspondent of the Associated Press at the Peace Conference and special assistant to the American Ambassador during the Russian Revolution. He is now on the staff of the Labor Advisory Board of the N.R.A.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Hazel Hawthorne, Harold Ward and Otis C. Ferguson.

DANCE

You are invited to

The Beach Costume Ball

of the ARTISTS and WRITERS DINNER CLUB

at the

HOTEL ROOSEVELT, Friday Eve, April 13

HARRY HERSHFIELD, Master of Ceremonies

Floor Show by Radio and Stage Stars

DANNY LOGAN and his Harlem Orchestra

Tickets, $2.00

sold at Hotels Roosevelt, Algonquin and Brevoort

FANNIE HURST, Chairman of Women's Committee

Mail checks to John Sloan, Treas., Hotel Brevoort, 11 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C. STy. 9-4674

THEATRE

"Superior to famous 'Road to Life.' "—*Times.* "Interesting . . . realistic . . . unusual . . . astonishing study in contemporary history."—*N. Y. Sun.*

Soviet-Amkino's Film Masterpiece

BROKEN SHOES

With Super-Imposed English Dialogue Titles

CAMEO THEATRE — CONTINUOUS — 25c

42nd Street East of Broadway 9:30 A. M. to 11:30 P. M. to 1 P. M.

PAMPHLET

New Homes for a New Deal

The four articles on housing by Lewis Mumford, Henry Wright, and Albert Mayer recently published in The New Republic, have been issued in pamphlet form.

Price 25 cents; less in quantities

The New Republic, 421 West 21st Street, New York, N. Y.

LECTURES

THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE

AT COOPER UNION

8th Street and Astor Place, at 8 o'clock

Admission Free

Sunday, April 8th

PROFESSOR HORACE M. KALLEN

"The Assault on Democracy."

Tuesday, April 10th

W. B. CURRY

"The Physics of the 19th Century. 2."

Friday, April 13th

EVERETT DEAN MARTIN

"Have Revolutions Ever Accomplished Their Aims?"

TRAVEL

Let Your Child Travel and Learn

Seeing the world—under careful and sympathetic guidance—is still the most enjoyable prelude to believing in it

Miss Nora Gwendolyn Hughes, B.A. Honours (London) is arranging a personally conducted tour for five American girls—14 to 15 years old—whose parents wish to give them a restful holiday, combined with unhurried travel through the picturesque countryside of England, Scotland, and Normandy. Entire land journey to be made by car in charge of Miss Winifred Burton, V.A.D.

Inclusive cost, $1,500

Sailing from New York, June 20

Returning.....August 23

For full particulars write:

MISS NORA GWENDOLYN HUGHES

Loudonville, New York

HOME WANTED

Would like to find home for mentally retarded boy of six; preferably where another such child lives; at a moderate rate; within New York City limits. Address Box 813, The New Republic.

SUMMMER PLACE WANTED

CAPE COD—Couple age 35, desire accommodations as paying guests. References exchanged. Address, Box 812, The New Republic.

FOR RENT

Croton-on-Hudson: Charming nine-room house, two baths, garage, river view, three acres, swimming pool. Sublet sacrifice, $100. Box 810, The New Republic.

Unfurnished: A one-room and kitchen apartment; bath, steam, fireplace; in old-fashioned house owned by The New Republic. Telephone, CHelsea 3-8393.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED